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Writing a grammar of Old Turkic has for two main reasons proven a quite formidable task. The first reason is the sheer size of the corpus, which has, during the last decade, kept growing at a breathtaking pace. At present, none of the three most voluminous sources, the Suvarnaprabhāśa, the Maitrīsimīt and the Daśakārmapathāvadāṇāmālā has as yet been edited in a way integrating all available manuscripts. Especially the DKPAM, with its lively narrative content containing so many specimens of direct speech, will no doubt further contribute to our knowledge of the language. As it is, I was not even able to work myself through all the extant published material so that, in principle, surprises in any section of the grammar are still possible. The only thing I can say is that such surprises have come less and less often during the last months.

Another reason why this task has proven to be a formidable one is the number of articles which appeared over the years on various phonological and morphological matters relevant for the questions which I have tried to answer. Although I have unfortunately been able to take this literature into account only to a limited extent, many will feel that I have indulged too much in argumentation with colleagues, thus giving various passages the air of papers in a journal. The fact is that I have, in many sections, felt the need not only to state my views but also to justify them as against competing opinions. This motive may sometimes also have led to an overaccumulation of examples, making reading difficult. However, those wishing to continue research into various topics will, I think, be thankful for a wealth of material which will, hopefully, help them reach their own judgements.

I would encourage colleagues to come forth with their criticisms. One domain which should be further developed is tense and aspect. Another matter which I have left for others is a detailed appraisal of the sources from a dialectological and diachronic point of view. The work will be attacked for having handled such diverse sources as the Orkhon inscriptions, Uyghur Tantric literature and the Qutadgu Bilig in a single grammar. This approach is, I think, at present justified by the fact that not all isoglosses seem to fit into neat bundles. Where mss. in Sogdian script share several linguistic features with the Qutadgu Bilig, where Orkhon Turkic forms and constructions find their specific explanation in Uyghur patterns, it would be highly counter-productive to split up the description. The present work is in any case quite unlikely to be the last.
word on the grammar of Old Turkic. Or so I hope, expecting this book to attract new scholars to this domain of research.

The passages quoted should not be mistaken for editions; for exact and full rendering of the texts the reader is referred to the work of the editors, or better to the facsimiles of the mss. as far as Uygur is concerned: Most of these are now readily available in excellent quality on the internet and all the ones extant in Germany will be available in the foreseeable future. Within the VATEC project Peter Zieme, Klaus Röhrborn and the present author have, together with our assistants M. Knüppel, Z. Özertural, J. Taube and, above all, Irina Nevskaya, undertaken the reedition of Uygur manuscripts (including the ones in runiform script). This electronic reedition offers a full transliteration, a transcription, interlinear morphological analysis, a German or English translation and a full thesaurus. In the present grammar I have – to enhance readability – sometimes felt free to tacitly disregard small lacunae, to spell out words which scribes traditionally write in abbreviated form (e.g. with missing vowels) and the like, especially in sections dealing with syntax. The runiform inscriptions deserve better documentation than is available to date.

I should apologize for not having offered interlinear morpheme and lexeme analysis of words and interlinear translations, which would have much enhanced usability for readers not all too familiar with Turkic. Doing that would, however, have lengthened the book by hundreds of pages, making its publication impossible.

Irina Nevskaya and Mark Kirchner read earlier versions of the book and offered valuable remarks (not always heeded); Peter Zieme helped with some information on readings. Mehmet Ölmez is undertaking the difficult task of preparing some indices. I would like to express my gratitude to these dear friends as well as to Patricia Radder from the Brill publishing house, who put enough pressure on me to bring the work to an end, but not too much for me to despair of it completely. And of course to Yona – for support during the last twenty years.

December 2003

Marcel Erdal
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Since prehistoric times, pastoral nomads roamed the Eurasian steppe belt while hunters and gatherers populated Siberia, the vast stretch of land to the north of this belt. South Siberia, with its fertile regions as the Minusa valley, served as meeting ground for these two types of cultures as well as attracting invaders from afar. Accounts about the inhabitants of these regions can be found in written documentation left to us by the Chinese, the Greeks and others who used writing before they themselves did so. Archaeology also has unearthed much about them and will no doubt bring more to light in the future. Some of these ethnical groups were Indo-European or, more exactly, Indo-Iranian and presumably also Proto-Tokharian. Others no doubt were Turkic or akin to the Turks: Chinese sources report towards the middle of the 6th century A.D. that people with this name had a sort of monopoly on iron mining in the Altai mountains. The modern or recent groups now lumped together as Palæo-Asiatic must have been indigenous to North Asia. In addition, some Uralic groups, coming from Western Siberia and North Eastern Europe, probably moved into this part of the world in fairly early times, as also Mongolic and Tunguz groups, which, however, came from the east. Although the languages of these peoples by all available evidence differed in genetic affiliation, their shared environments and their contacts over time must have generated various sorts of affinity among them as to material and spiritual culture and, indeed, anthropological characteristics. Through confederations among Central Eurasian ethnical units as well as the subjugation of one group by another, political entities were created, as a result of which culturally or linguistically differing groups found themselves within larger states. Language contact and convergence are among the normal results of such processes.

1.1. Early and Proto-Turkic and Altaic

In this book, which deals with language, we are interested in linguistic identity, in this case in ethnicities speaking varieties of Turkic; not in anthropological or cultural identity as documented in descriptions by neighbouring societies or unearthed by archaeologists, nor in ethnical or political identity as emerging from the accounts accumulated among
nations in Western or Eastern Asia. Whether such early North East Asian peoples as the Xiung-nu, Central Asian peoples as the Wusun or Eastern European peoples as the Huns spoke Turkic languages is not known; their identity is therefore irrelevant for the intents and purposes of the present work. When differing tribes shared one political fate either of their own will or after having been incorporated into some framework by force, they would, in the course of time, converge in various ways, not only administratively but also culturally and linguistically. Thus, tribes not being Turkic by origin might have adopted some form of Turkic language or dialect, modifying it even while adopting it, whereas some Turkic tribes may have given up their Turkic idiom. What interests us here is linguistic identity to the exclusion of all other ways in which ethnic groups can be labelled. Turkic-speaking state elites would have made their variant of Turkic into the national language, sometimes causing other (Turkic or non-Turkic) groups to use it, perhaps as a written language, beside the idiom they themselves spoke; this may have been the case in the Khazar state, for instance. On the other hand, Turks could well have had to use some language beside their own if they found themselves in a political, ethnical or cultural constellation in which some other language occupied the central position; or, alternately, they may have used another language for writing purposes instead of beginning to write their own: For instance, the Turkic military elites of the Ghaznavid and Sülçük states (starting with the 10th century A.D.) wrote Persian or Arabic but no Turkic. Thus, the identity of the elite of the first Türk empire (6th-7th centuries A.D.) is of no interest to us here as long as their only text which (at present) is known to us is a Sogdian inscription, no possible Turkic etymologies being available for any of the titles mentioned in it. Similarly, it would not make much sense to try to delimit an ethnic identity which spoke Proto-Turkic, although Proto-Turkic is a useful linguistic tool worth constructing (or 'reconstructing').

Turkic does start to become tangible as a linguistic entity at least around the beginning of the Christian era, when neighbouring nations learn and document words which we can identify as being clearly Turkic (by morphological shape, for instance): A case in point is the term *suvlag* ‘watering place’, found in early Chinese sources, where

---

2 Cf. Schmitt 1971. There were several places of this name, one of them being Kāşgar.
at least the suffix is definitely Turkic. The matter is often not as simple as in this case, in that foreign documentation often consists of titles, which tend to get passed from one language to another: If, in Hungary, the Avar ruler was called kaganus, this by itself does not mean that the Avars were Turks: As it happens, the source of this title appears not to have been Turkic in the first place, and it was also borrowed by other Central Eurasian nations. Some further evidence may indicate that the Avars spoke some form of Turkic.

The Turkic languages are genetically fairly close-knit although they have, of course, diverged in time (and, in certain cases, converged). Reconstructing the hypothetical Proto-Turkic language through the genetic comparison of the Turkic languages seems to be a feasible goal, but work in this direction has been slow, sometimes marred by dilettantism: Much of it took place in the Soviet Union, where too much weight was put on modern evidence at the expense of earlier stages of the language. Scholars have put much less energy and thought into a model of inner-Turkic genetic affinities than into the Altaic problem: the question whether the great number of lexical and grammatical units and typological traits which Turkic shares with the Mongolic group of languages and, to a considerably lesser extent, with the Tunguz languages, Korean and Japanese points at a genetic relationship or whether it is attributable to borrowing, copying activity or coincidence. This question, which deserves collective treatment by specialists for the different languages and language groups, will not be dealt with here.

What is certain is that a lot of the contact involving the copying of specific items in all domains of language between Turkic and Mongolic on the one hand, Mongolic and Tunguz on the other hand took place before the peoples speaking these languages began putting them into writing. It is therefore in any case useful to speak of ‘Altaic languages’ as a term covering at least these three language groups; as an areal term if not as a genetic one. Turkic and Mongolic may well be related genetically (my knowledge of the other languages is quite insufficient for me to make any statements in this respect) but adequate serious research on the nature of their relationship is still lacking.

---

3 Not to be confused with +JXg, which is found also in Mongolic. The symbol + here used marks nominal juncture, whereas - is used to indicate juncture between verbs and their suffixes.
4 The author has pointed out in a review (Erdal 1997) that clear similarities exist also with Hurro-Urartian; cf. further Erdal 1998 for the domain of verb formation in Turkic and Mongolic.
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The earliest discovered documents written in Central Eurasia are Indo-European and Chinese. When, in the 6th century A.D., the first Türk kaghanate was formed in present-day Mongolia, its rulers appear to have used Sogdian, an Iranian language, for writing. At about the same time, the Turkic-speaking Khazars formed a state in the Turkic Far West, in an area roughly bound by the Caucasus, the Ural river (called Yayık in Turkic, Δᾶξ in Greek sources) and present-day Ukraine. Runiform inscriptions discovered in this region and further west were presumably inscribed some time during the second half of the first millennium A.D. They can be attributed to the Khazars, to the Avars, to the equally Turkic Pechenegs or Bolgars or to other Turkic ethnic entities, but interpretations proposed for them are unsatisfactory and doubtful.

The earliest readable, understandable and datable Turkic texts are the official inscriptions of the second Turk kaghanate, the Orkhon inscriptions, the first of which appears to have been from slightly before 720 A.D.; the runiform alphabet in which these inscriptions are written was deciphered by Vilhelm Thomsen in 1893. The age of the inscriptions found in South Siberia near the upper Yenisey river, most of which are in the same script, is not known for certain; some of them may well be older than the Orkhon inscriptions. The Bactrian ms. from Afghanistan edited by Sims Williams (2000a) contain a number of Old Turkic words and word groups; they are no doubt linked to the domination of the Western Türk after they vanquished the Hephthalites together with the Sassanians. The earliest of these documents have been dated into the first half of the 7th century; they are thus the earliest sources containing Old Turkic phrases (and not just single terms): These words and phrases (e.g. tapaglïg ‘revered’ in a document from 640 A.D.) are clearly in the same language as other Old Turkic sources. Through their appearance in the West Asian part of Turkic expansion, the term ‘East Old Turkic’ used by Johanson (2001 and elsewhere) to refer to this language is made obsolete: Old Turkic as here described was presumably, with minor variation, used in West Turkestan as well (which is, after all, where Qarakhanid is documented), and all the way south to Bactria.

The earliest accessible Turkic sources in Eastern Europe are the few sentences left to us by the Danube Bolgars, which (like Bactrian) are in

5 See above, and footn. 1.
6 kîn ‘queen, consort’ may actually be more archaic than Old Turkic kunčay in view of the shape of the source of this term in Early Middle Chinese; the Bactrian ms. in which kîn appears seven times in reference to a Khaladj princess is dated to the year 711, which makes it contemporaneous with the Orkhon inscriptions.
Greek writing and belong to the 9th or 10th centuries. While all early Asian documentation represents a single fairly close-knit language, the sparse and difficult Danube Bulgarian material is aberrant, represents a different idiom and is not taken into consideration here. Nor are the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions, which date from the Middle Turkic period (13th-14th century); both corpuses in any case represent different languages than the one described here. To this latter material one might add words borrowed from varieties of early and middle European Turkic into Hungarian. This rich evidence is important for the reconstruction of Proto-Turkic and but unlikely to give specific evidence for the language dealt with here. Kâşgârî in the 11th century gives linguistic information on a number of Turkic dialects or languages of his time; see Brockelmann 1921 and Dankoff & Kelly 1985 on this.

The corpus of extant Turkic is conveniently divided into three periods, old, middle and modern. The end of the Old Turkic period was brought about by the impact of the Mongol invasion in the 13th century, which covered everything from South China to Poland and Hungary, from Eastern Siberia to Syria and Central Anatolia. Involving the whole of the Turkic world, it at first put most of the Turks to flight, breaking up social structures and rearranging ethnic geography. Subsequently, most Turkic groups were engulfed in the boundless Mongol empire and its successor states, in which they were usually the culturally and ethnically dominating though not the leading element; this had the effect of enhancing inter-Turkic linguistic contact and leveling. During the Middle Turkic period, which was ushered in by this upheaval, most of the Turkic world became Islamic; except, that is, those parts of it which were dominated by China and later by the (Mongolian) Kalmyks. Islam brought about greater literacy among much of the Turkic world. The Eastern part of Chinese Turkestan, Gansu, Mongolia and Southern Siberia including and east of the Altay range remained outside the influence of Islam. In this eastern and north eastern part of Asia, Turks went on adhering to Buddhism or to varieties of Shamanism, partly influenced by Buddhism. In Eastern Europe there were also Christian and Jewish Turkic-speaking groups, but very little written material has survived from them from the early Middle Turkic period; the 14th century Codex Comanicus is one important Christian Middle Turkic source (in Latin characters). Middle Turkic is, on the whole, characterized by two or three written languages in the Islamic literary tradition,

7 See Erdal 1988 for one important such source and its relationship with the Danube-Bulgarian inscriptions.
8 See Erdal 1993 for the Volga Bulgarian corpus.
often quite distinct from the dialects and languages spoken by the authors, evolving over time and actually varying from author to author and indeed from manuscript to manuscript. However, the sources of this period practically from the beginning show a clear division between four ethnically and geographically distinct dialect groups crystallizing into written languages: Eastern Turkic, Kipchak, Bolgarian and Oguz.

Northern and central parts of all this was then gradually incorporated into Russia. The Modern Turkic period starts around the middle of the 19th century, when scholars such as Castrén, Vámbéry, Raquette, Böhtlingk or Radloff described as yet unwritten Turkic languages and dialects of High Asia. At about the same time, Christian missionaries initiated the alphabetisation of some of these languages with the purpose of spreading their faith; this is how the first sources of Chuvash or Shor were printed. Travellers such as Stralenberg or Pallas had, since the 18th century, supplied the scholarly world with some preliminary information about such languages. By the end of the 19th century Kazakh, Azeri or Ottoman authors were increasingly making their written languages look like their speech. For languages like Tatar or Turkmen, parting from the Arabic alphabet in the 20th century was the decisive step into a relatively faithful representation of national tongues.

Old Turkic as described in this book comprises all extant texts written in early Asian Turkic as well as phrases appearing in sources in other Asian languages such as the Bactrian mss. or the Mahrnāmag edited by F.W.K. Müller (SEddTF III 151-190). Since early European Turkic is practically nonexistent as an unstarred entity, no confusion can, we think, come from using the term ‘Old Turkic’ to refer not to an abstract stage in the history of the Turkic languages in general, but to a specific language once spoken in central regions of Asia, and delimited by the corpus which represents it. My use of the term ‘Common Turkic’ is explained in the following section.

1.2. The Old Turkic corpus and its parts

This book deals with the remains of what was written down in the Asian domains of the early Turks, which consists of three corpuses:

1) Two hundred odd inscriptions in the Old Turkic runiform script, presumably 7th to 10th century. These were discovered mostly in present day Mongolia (the area covering the territory of the second Türk empire and the Uygur steppe empire following upon it) and in the upper Yenisey basin (the domains of the Qırqız and Çık tribes) in central South Siberia. A few readable runiform inscriptions were discovered
further west, in the Altay mountains all the way to the Irtysch river, sporadically all over present-day Kazakhstan and Kirgizstan (here especially in Talas, the capital of the Western Second Türk kaghanate) and the north eastern part of Chinese Turkestan; see e.g. Vasil’ev 1976/78 for a short survey. Most of these are epitaphs, but some are mere graffiti on prominent rocks by the side of main roads. There also are some objects (e.g. coins, mirrors, bricks, a spindle whorl, bowls) inscribed with the same script. Many of the runiform inscriptions from Mongolia are official, but most of the other ones stem from common (though sometimes obviously highly regarded) individuals.

2) Old Uygur manuscripts from the eastern part of present-day Xinjiang and Gansu (China), from the 9th century on, in the Uygur, Manichaean, runiform, Brâhmi, Sogdian, Syriac, and Tibetan scripts. Most of them are kept in Berlin but there are collections also in London, St. Petersburg, Paris, Kyôto, Stockholm, Helsinki, Ankara, Istanbul and China itself; a few pieces have landed elsewhere. The Uygur ms. corpus is by far the most extensive among the three. Much of it consists of Buddhist, Manichaean or Christian religious material, but there are also legal documents such as contracts, personal or administrative letters, medical or astrological treatises, glossaries, folkloric sources and prose and verse narrative texts. Approximately three quarters of the whole corpus consist of Buddhist sources (mostly belonging to its mūhâyana branch). Manichaean sources make up less than 10%, but most of these are relatively old. The Christian texts are the least numerous and do not seem to be particularly early. The present description tries to base itself in principle primarily on mss. thought to antedate the (mid-13th century) establishment of Mongol rule. Sources from the rule of the Yuan (i.e. Mongolian) dynasty were by their authors meant to be in the same language as earlier sources, however, and can be difficult to tell from earlier ones.

Uygur scholars nowadays broadly distinguish three stages: The pre-classical stage including most of the Manichaean material but also Buddhist texts like the extensive Sângim ms. of the Maitrisimit; the so-

---

9 We will, henceforth, use the term Uygur to refer to Old Uygur as being described here, rather than to Modern Uygur now spoken in Xinjiang, Kazakhstan etc., or to Middle Uygur as documented from Ming and other pre-modern sources.

10 There is sometimes some confusion regarding the linguistic assignment of the runiform mss., e.g. in Johanson 1998: 85: These are written in the same language as the rest of Xinjiang Uygur (within which there are dialect differences); the language of the runiform inscriptions of the Uygur Empire found on steles in Mongolia is, on the other hand, practically the same as that of Orkhon Turkic.
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called koiné\textsuperscript{11} stage, including e.g. the translations made from Chinese by the team of Şıko Şali Tutuş or the DKPAM, and, thirdly, the late Uygur stage which we find in Tantric texts like the Totenbuch edited by Kara and Zieme. Criteria for the linguistic dating of Old Turkic sources were first offered in Erdal 1979 (a reformulation of a section in Erdal 1976). The topic was subsequently taken up by several scholars, fullest by Doerfer 1993. We will come back to the question of relative dating within Uygur further on in this section.

3) 11\textsuperscript{th} century Turkic texts from the Qarakhanid state: In Arabic writing, the \textit{Qutadgu Bilig}, a poem consisting of six thousand odd couplets by Yūsuf the Chamberlain,\textsuperscript{12} and the \textit{Dīwān lugātī i-Turk}, an Arabic-Turkic lexicon and encyclopedia featuring morphological, derivational and dialectological notes, by Maḥmūd of Kāṣgār.\textsuperscript{13} Land sale documents in Uygur writing found in Yarkand\textsuperscript{14} are the only direct Turkic Muslim ms. evidence from the period, since the three QB mss. and the only ms. of the DLT are not autographs but somewhat later copies. Maḥmūd also quotes forms from dialects other than his own, the DLT thus serving as earliest evidence\textsuperscript{15} for other early varieties of Turkic. Material from other varieties is, in general, excluded from the present work: Qarakhanid grammar is close enough to Uygur grammar to make a single description for both corpuses meaningful, which is not necessarily the case with other material quoted in the DLT. Features of other dialects are not, however, disregarded; e.g.: The Oguz cognates of

\textsuperscript{11} This term (used by Röhrborn and Laut in a number of their publications at least since 1984) is, I think, unfortunate, as it is misleading to outsiders: Greek koiνή means ‘common’; \textit{koinē diαlektos} was the name originally given to the relatively late, post-classical variety of Greek which was mostly based on the Ionian dialect and replaced practically all the (other) Greek dialects to serve as common language not only to Greeks but also to others who came under their sway or adopted their culture. The variety of Uygur which is, I think, better just called ‘Classical’ or ‘Standard’ is a stage in the development of the language and of its spelling when it had established relatively strong and clear norms. The language apparently was, at this stage, spoken more or less as it was written, which was probably no longer the case for Late Uygur sources.

\textsuperscript{12} Edited by Arat (1947), translated into English (with important notes) in Dankoff 1983. Tezcan 1981 will also be important for a better edition in the future.

\textsuperscript{13} Dankoff & Kelly 1982-85 is an edition of the Turkic (transcribed and transliterated), couched in an English translation of the Arabic parts of the text.

\textsuperscript{14} Erdal 1984.

\textsuperscript{15} The reliability of the DLT cannot be wholly taken for granted in this specific matter, as Maḥmūd was not, of course, a field researcher in the modern sense; but his evidence does seem convincing. Most of the information supplied by Kāṣgār on the dialects has not yet been matched with modern and comparative data and there is as yet no conclusive investigation of this question.
äšgäk ‘donkey’, buš-gak ‘asthma’ and the dative suffix +kA, which lack the velars of the quoted forms altogether, are certainly relevant for our view on the shape of these Old Turkic elements; they show that äšgäk and bušgak must have had g and not k although k would have been a possible reading of what is documented, and that there must, beside +kA, also have been an early variant dative suffix +gA. koymaŋiz and kiymaŋiz, which are in DLT fol.289 quoted as Oguz and Kıpçak forms for the negated 2nd person plural imperative, are relevant for Turkic in general, because they show that /d/ > /y/ had taken place in at least some Early Turkic dialects already in the second half of the 11th century, and that -(X)yŋ-lAr had not been generalised to all early dialects.

The legend of Oguz Kagan, which is considered to be in Old Turkic e.g. by Šćerbak 1961 and in the DTS, is written in a form of Chagatay, a stage of Turkic which is quite different from Old Turkic and much later. Buyan Ävirmäk, a text stretch found at the end of the 18th century, was added at a very late stage and cannot be called ‘Old Turkic’ either. Nor can the 12th century Atabat 1-Haqā’iq, which should be considered to belong to Middle Turkic though its composition took place in the Qarakhanid realm. A weakness of descriptions of Old Turkic by Soviet scholars was that they described Uygur together with such Middle Turkic sources, taking all of them to be expressions of a single language. Among the three mss. of the QB, ms. A is very late; its content is not evidence for the text except when considered together with mss. B and C. R.R. Arat had, in 1947, published an edition of the QB based on all three mss.; not knowing this edition or disregarding it, Soviet scholars quoted each of the three mss. as if each were a source by itself.16

The three source groups mentioned constitute all the early written remains of Common Turkic17 in so far as they can be read at present: Many short inscriptions discovered west of Chinese Turkestan and South Siberia, e.g. in the Altay region, are hard to decipher: Where aberrant forms have been read, there is the possibility of misreadings.

---

16 Thus also in the DTS. Such errors can have long-lasting influence. E.g., Anderson 2002 gives kir- as an inchoative auxiliary verb, quoting a phrase ‘sevä kiršä’ for “KB II 42” from Šćerbak 1961: 153. It turns out that this is a reference to what ms. A alone has in QB 403, while the other ms. extant for this passage has something quite different. There is no other ‘evidence’ for kir- as auxiliary in Old Turkic.

17 I here use ‘common’ in the sense of ‘ordinary’, to refer to what Schönig 1997: 119-120 calls ‘Norm Turkic’. Schönig there uses ‘Common Turkic’ to refer to the diasystem + ‘diadictionary’ which is the lowest common denominator of all Turkic languages; this is a concept for which I have no use and which is not what I have in mind. The term ‘Norm Turkic’ sounds, I feel, too normative.
Turkic words and phrases found in sources in Bactrian, Sogdian or other Indo-European languages of Asia sometimes constitute useful material on what is clearly the same language. Non-Bolgarian forms of Middle Turkic appear to be relatively close to Old Turkic, allowing for dialect differences mostly already attested in the DLT. Their predecessors may thus not have been very different from Old Turkic, though the language of most Middle and Modern Turkic sources does not go back directly to Old Turkic as we have it documented in the corpuses mentioned above. If some modern Turkic languages seem much too aberrant to go back to dialects closely akin to Old Turkic, this is often due to substrates or adstrates.

Old Turkic is not identical with Proto-Turkic, nor is it the ancestor of Common Turkic in the sense that (Vulgar) Latin is the ancestor of the Romance languages. бён ‘I’, e.g., is still retained in Modern Turkish, but the Bilgä Kagan and Köln Tegin inscriptions from the banks of the Orkhon river have only мён, the assimilated secondary form. букур ‘to command’ has in Old Turkic (including Orkhon Turkic) been replaced by yarlı(g)ka- but lives on in practically all Turkic languages outside Siberia and is the source of the Old Turkic title буюрук. уд- ‘to follow’ survives only in the Oguz languages, but the adverb уду ‘following, after’, which is common in Old Turkic, must come from it. Various Common Turkic features have dropped out from Old Turkic: The -гAn participle, which is alive in practically all Turkic languages, had disappeared from most of Old Turkic except in a few petrified forms (and in some sources written in Sogdian writing); the -гAy form, which is used as future or optative or with content related to epistemic mood in a great number of Turkic languages including Uygur, had disappeared from Orkhon Turkic, though there are some examples in the Yenisey inscriptions. Proto-Common Turkic would also have had an element related to Turkish değil for negating nominal predicates. Nor can -(A)Im for the 1st person plural hortative have been primary, since a number of Common Turkic languages also have -(A)И as 1st person exclusive or inclusive or some such meaning; the additional m clearly comes from general 1st person marking and -(A)ИI may have been the original form. Extending our scope of ‘Old Turkic’ beyond the Orkhon inscriptions, we find additional secondary features: e.g.

---

18 In view of its limited documentation, уд- could, in principle, also have come from уду by back-formation.

19 This is a matter mentioned also by Doerfer 1975-76: 9, who writes: "Atu. is, so to say, not the grand-father of all modern Ctu languages but their grand-uncle. It shows some specific (dialect) features."
vowel roundings after onset /b/ in words such as /büť- ‘to come to an end, be perfected’, /büzagü ‘calf’ or /bulän ‘cloud’ in runiform mss., whereas a number of modern Turkic languages have the original unrounded vowels; also, e.g., words starting with /m/ < /b/ when the next syllable has a nasal. Verbal forms like /köd-mä-ŋ-łar ‘don’t put (pl.)’ are also secondary, as is the alternative form in /-mA-ŋ-Xz/ which, as already Käšgarî says, was used by the Oguz. The ancestor of Common Turkic (as a theoretical construction) was, in any case, probably quite similar to Old Turkic in many respects. Old Turkic must therefore be taken note of as a very central ingredient of any reconstruction of Proto-Turkic (the ancestor, that is, of Common Turkic, Khaladj, Chuvash etc.). Another important source for this reconstruction is evidence from Mongolic.

Due to some of its characteristics (e.g. the hortative in -(A)Im, the future in -däčI instead of -gAy), Doerfer 1975-76a: 83 thought that Orkhon Turkic was especially close to Oguz Turkic;20 other scholars e.g. Tezcan) have also subscribed to this view, which deserves further consideration.

The three corpuses mentioned above represent a coherent group of fuzzy dialects differing most in the lexicon (as they belong to different cultural domains), certainly also in morphology and in some ways also in phonology. Syntactic differences may in part be due to the fact that the corpuses contain different textual types, but also reflect the gradual Turkification of much of the population using Uygur, and historical development. Translations, which constitute most of our corpus 2 (though by no means all of it), were, in particular, carried out by bilingual committees. Corpuses 1 and 2 are not dialectally homogeneous; phonic and grammatical differences between the corpuses are probably not greater than those found within them. Geographical dialects can hardly be worked out within group 2, as mss. for public use would travel and be copied by scribes differing in dialect;21 personal documents are relatively short and rather repetitive. Phonic and morphological differences are not as great as to necessitate distinct descriptions for different texts or text groups. Nevertheless, our description cannot pretend to be based on a homogenous corpus but will, where deemed

---

20 Johanson 1998: 85 writes about the language of the Orkhon inscriptions: “Though it exhibits some features that are later typical of Oguz, it may well be taken to represent a Common Turkic that has not yet split into Oghuz, Kipchak and Uyghur.” This is clearly mistaken.

21 Some features possibly characterising the dialect of Khotan are mentioned further on in this section. See Doerfer 1993: 3 and the reference given there to work of Bazin for the exact coordinates of places where mss. and inscriptions were discovered.
appropriate, include observations on dialect variation and diachrony as well. We will straightway mention phonetic, phonological, morphological and syntactic features with which scholars have tried to characterise the variation between the different texts; detailed discussion of these features will then take place in the different sections of the grammar dealing with the elements affected. The differences within Old Turkic are by no means greater than e.g. within Old Greek.

There are, however, some clear differences even between the runiform inscriptions from Mongolia: Tūn has bán as independent pronoun but uses män within the verb phrase, while KT and BQ have män everywhere; ŠU from the (later) Uygar kaghanate again has bán as independent pronoun, however, and Taryat even has bán following a verb form. These differences can be qualified as ‘progressive’ vs. ‘regressive’ as they do not fit into the ‘earlier’ / ‘later’ scheme which Doerfer 1994: 111 tries to apply to them. He there (p.109) also shows that it is the KT and BQ inscriptions (and ŠU from the Uygar kaghanate) which most often do not leave/e/ implicit but write it as i, whereas the earliest inscriptions Tūn, Ongin and KČ on the one hand, the Uygar inscriptions Tariat and Tes on the other, practically always leave it unexpressed. It is again (same work, p.110) KT, BQ and ŠU that always write/e/ out as Y in open syllables, and again KT and BQ which show the sound change [yä] > [ye] in the beginning of the words yäg ‘better’, yägirmi ‘20’, yär ‘place’ and yätti ‘seven’.

Several linguistic criteria can serve to distinguish between language forms within Uygar, either as dialects or as historical stages. The fate of early Old Turkic fû has been much discussed in the literature and is here dealt with in section 2.33; all agree that its retention as a distinct phoneme (as in Lena Turkic) is archaic. It converged with ìn/ in the Arghu dialect as documented by Kašgari, but there are hardly any traces of such a feature in any variety of Uygar: It will be found in section 2.33 that ‘anîg’ < aîîg ‘bad’ and ‘köînûr’ < köînûr- ‘to burn (tr.)’, given as only examples in the literature for NY turning to N, can in fact be read as aî(i)g and köînûr– in all instances referred to. I have found a single possible exception, mentioned below. In most Uygar texts, all words containing fû in runiform sources appear with /yl/. Where Uygar texts have both NY and Y in these words, such as kanyu ~ kayu ‘which’ both found in the (early) London scroll of the Säkiz Yükmâk Yarok (TT VI), we take either the language to have been in transition to

---

22 This distinction later led to the generalization of the person category in verb forms.
23 Small capitals are used for transliterating Semitic alphabets.
the progressive variant with /y/, or scribes whose language had already lost /h/ to have made copies from mss. which still had /h/, introducing the change sporadically. In Oguz Turkic /h/ becomes /yn/ (with a vowel intruding between /y/ and /n/ when demanded by syllable structure) but this does not (except in the word koñ > koyn ‘sheep’) happen in Uygur. All of Uygur can therefore be characterised as a bundle of dialects, like many of the Turkic languages today; the runiform mss. are a possible exception, and there is the exception of some mss. in Sogdian script, where we seem to find a clear instance of anīg; see further on in this section for that. If, as pointed out by Röhrborn 1983, the Sängim ms. of Mait exclusively has /h/ > /y/ but on the other hand all the characteristics of early Uygur texts, this should come as no surprise: The copyist of this ms. was more efficient than e.g. the one of the London scroll of TT VI in doing away with instances of /ny/; had the latter’s personal language not already undergone the process, he would not have made the replacement at all.

Additional characteristics which are used for the distinction between dialects or between pre-classical and classical sources (depending on the viewpoint) are the presence of the converb suffixes -(X)pAn 24 or even -(X)pAnXn instead of or beside -(X)p (all dealt with in section 3.286); the use of the case ending +dA/+tA and not +dIn to express ablative meaning (discussed in section 4.1106); the inscriptive use of the projection participle in -sXk where all mss. except the Xw use -gU and -gUlxk instead (see all three in section 3.284); the appearance of low unrounded vowels in the genitive, instrumental and accusative 27 case suffixes and in the accusative allomorph for the 3rd person possessive suffix, in the 1st and 2nd person singular and plural possessive and perfect suffixes, the 1st person singular and plural and 2nd person...
plural volitional suffixes, the converb suffix -(X)p, the formatives +lxg and +sxz and the passive suffix -(X)l-, which all generally have high vowels (section 2.24);28 the appearance of /s/ as s in one ms. (discussed in section 2.35); rounding in verbal inflexional affixes in some mss. in Sogdian script and two others, discussed further on in this section; the appearance of the instrumental suffix as +(X)n and not as +(I)n (q.v. in section 3.124); the non-nasal shape of -dXj as e.g. käl-tig ‘you came’ in Pañc 192 which accords with similar realisations of hI/ as /g/ in runiform inscriptions (as discussed in section 2.34); the distribution of the participles in -(X)glI and -(X)gmA (in productive use only in early texts; see section 3.282) and the (mostly agentive) forms ending in -gUČI and -dČI (discussed in sections 3.113 and 3.282): The Orkhon inscriptions have -dČI (-mČI in the negative) as future suffix while the rest of Old Turkic has -gAy. Opinions have varied on whether differences concerning such criteria may be indications of dialects29 or of different stages of the language or both. Doerfer 1993, who devoted a monograph to the topic of the dating of Old Turkic, uses 30 characteristics for this purpose, some of them graphic (see section 2.1), or in the phonological, the morphological and the lexical domains.

Many Manichaean texts appear to be pre-classical, but the Pothi book (TT III etc.) has clear signs of lateness. Among Buddhist texts, the Šāngim ms. of the Mait, the London scroll of TT VI, BuddhBio and another section of a Buddha biography edited in U II 4-7, possibly the KP text30 and (not noted hitherto) the Vairocana fragment T I D 200 (Mainz 774) last edited by Zieme in a footnote in AoF VIII (1981): 242 show signs of being early. BuddhKat was by its editors Maue &

---

28 The lowering appears also in bar-am ‘livestock’ formed with the formative -(X)m, attested in M III Nr.6 III 17, in a ms. belonging together with M I 7-17 and ManErz I. The feature of lowering is assigned to the Oguz dialect by Kağıt but in Uyghur it is a variable characteristic of early sources where /a/ /a/ are not conditioned by specific adjacent consonants. If Kağıt is right this may mean that there was an Oguz influence on early texts, or that the Oguz were relatively numerous among the Manichaean. It would also go well with the idea that there is a special Oguz = Orkhon Turkic connection, as Orkhon Turkic influence on the language of the inscriptions of the Uyghur Kaghanate is obvious.

29 One should here remember that the distribution of dialects need not be geographic but can also be linked to communities. The Arabic dialects spoken in Baghdad in the first half of the 20th century by Muslims, Christians and Jews, e.g. were quite distinct; in one town in Western Persia Jews and Christians spoke two dialects of Neo-Aramaic which were not even mutually intelligible.

30 This ms. appears to be, more than some other sources, a late copy of a quite early text by a rather sloppy copyist, who not only made a number of mistakes but also introduced some very late forms towards the end.
Röhrborn declared to be pre-classical because it has low vowels where the standard ms. write high ones and has several examples of the +dA form serving in ablative meaning. On the other hand -sA as conditional suffix instead of -sAr and käräk ‘necessity, necessary’ instead of kärägäk as well as the haplogy of syllables containing /rl/ are late or at least progressive features. Vowel lowering in BuddhKat has no significance in this matter, however, as it takes place only beside /g/ and /rL/. Whether +dA never serves in standard Uygur texts in the constructions found in BuddhKat needs to be checked. Cf. the following: The Mait (both mss.) shows a number of ablative locatives, one instance of the converb in -(X)pAn and two in -(X)pAnIn (the Hami ms. has at least two additional ones of the latter), a few instances each of -(X)gmA and -(X)glI and, as a spelling feature, a number of instances of /hj/ spelled in both front and back contexts with K alone. The pre-classical features of the London scroll of the Säkiz Yükmäk Yarok, edited in TT VI, are the lowering of vowels, six instances of kanyu ‘which’ beside 12 instances of kayu, more than 20 examples of aniğ (presumably to be read as any(ï)g; cf. the end of section 2.33) and of a derivate, instances of the superfluous alef, the +dA form used as ablative and productive use of -(X)glI.

Some fragments of mss. written in Sogdian script (edited by D. Fedakâr) clearly show a distinct dialect: They have some loss of pronominal n (e.g. san+i+ça) as found in Eastern Middle Turkic and in the Southeastern group of modern Turkic languages and the phrase ölgän+dä kur tul- ‘to be saved from dying’, with the participle in -gAn used as event noun. A conspicuous feature of these fragments is the vowel rounding in inflexional suffixes when adjacent to a labial consonant (kurtgar-dum, tap-un-tilar, ängän-üp; tak+umuz, si-dumuz, baçama-dumuz); cf. section 2.402 for more details on this process. The possessive suffix +XmXz is replaced by +UmUz and the preterit suffix -dXmXz by -dUmUz also in one ms. of the Xw, and the ms. Pelliot Ouïgour 2, HamTouHou 18.7 has the forms tilädüzüm istädüzüm. This latter is a letter written in Khotan (as the text says); that particular Xw ms. and the ms. in Sogdian script could therefore also reflect the Khotan dialect.31 On the other hand, aniğ ‘bad’, damaged but visible in a fragment in Sogdian script, shows that what we have here is a rare

31 ävigä ‘to his home’ in HamTouHou 18.4 is not necessarily an instance of the loss of pronominal n, as ‘WXLYK’ for oğläp ‘to his son’ in l.10 shows that the ms. spells /ŋ/ as K: /ɡ/ would have been spelled as X in a back-harmony word. The genitive form mümäg for mümäg ‘mine’ in l.6 probably has the same explanation. The 2nd person imperative plural form read istäglär in the same line is not necessarily an instance of /hj/ > /ŋ/ either, as it can also be read as ist(a)glär.
instance of the so-called n dialect (see section 2.33). Both -dUm and Ń > n are, according to Kāšgārī,\textsuperscript{32} characteristics of the speech of the Argu; these Sogdian script mss. may therefore also represent this dialect. Another noteworthy feature of the Sogdian script mss. are several examples of an extended form of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person imperative (e.g. artama-zumī), found also in the QB.\textsuperscript{33} We know that Argu was spoken in Balasagun, and Yūsuf, the author of the QB, was born in this town. This as well should therefore be an Argu feature. A further feature shared by the Sogdian script mss. with the QB are the fused impossibility forms (alumadī < ali umadi, alkumaz < alka umaz). Balasagun was in West Turkistan; this proximity to the original homeland of the Sogds may explain their Sogdian palæography and spelling characteristics.

On the other hand, the Sogdian script fragments have also retained the pre-classical feature of sporadic and unconditioned vowel lowering. Laut 1986 considers a Buddhist text to be pre-classical also when it has Indian loans in Sogdian shape and adds a further criterion for early dating: the introduction of superfluous alefs, not in the onset and unjustified through any likely pronunciation before vowels within words; e.g. yig'it 'young man' or av'uci (the name of a hell called avīci in Sanskrit). For these two reasons he also adds the Saddh to his list of pre-classical texts, although it lacks all other criteria. Superfluous alefs in a Manichæan text and in the Sāngim ms. of the Mait are given in Laut 1986: 69-70; instances in mss. in Sogdian script are listed by Fedakār in UAJb N.F. 10(1991): 93-94 (to be used together with the glossary in UAJb N.F. 14(1996): 196-201 and the transliterations). The lowering of unrounded high vowels is apparently equally common in the Sāngim and Hami mss., though not necessarily in the same words.

Gabain in several places expressed the view that the texts written in Brāhmī script constitute a dialect of their own. According to her they are characterized by (among other things) p in the onset of words and by o in non-first syllables. These sources do indeed seem to use p and b indiscriminately in onset position; however, this may have been caused by influence from the Uygur writing system, which spells all /b/s with

\textsuperscript{32} The DLT (fol.504) ascribes the pronunciation bardum, kāldum (vs. bardam among the Oguz and bardīm among the other Turks) to the dialect of the Argu.

\textsuperscript{33} Gabain 1976 expresses the view that this 'I is the possessive suffix but there seems to be no sense in that. I could imagine that it is a truncated īd! 'Let go!', comparable to English 'Let him do this'; īd- also serves as actionality auxiliary for energetic action which became morphologised in some modern languages, and should also be behind the 'I which we find at the end of imperative forms of certain Khaladj verbs. As Doerfer has shown in various places, Argu as described in the DLT shares several linguistic features with Khaladj.
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the letter P. As for o and ö in second or subsequent syllables, that appears also in texts in Tibetan writing like the catechism from Dunhuang and in the hippological glossary in southern Brāhmī and reflects, we think, general Uygur pronunciation: The Uygur, Manichaean and runiform writing systems do not distinguish o from ö and u from ü in any case. Are there any explicit differences which distinguish Brāhmī texts from others? Such is, for instance, the syncopated spelling of the suffix +ldUrXk, which appears as +ldruk in sakaldruk ‘throat strap on a headstall’ and kömüldrüx ‘breast strap’ in the hippological word list in Southern Brāhmī, and boyontrok in TT VIII A (Northern Brāhmī): Sources in both the Uygur and Arabic scripts consistently spell the suffix with explicit W after the alveolar. There is an instance or two where a stem-final i appears as ö in a converb form in -(X)p. BuddhKat, a quite early text in Tibetan script, has other relevant characteristics: the conditional in -sA instead of -sAr, otherwise documented e.g. in Uygur medical texts (which were presumably written more carelessly than, e.g., religious texts), the haplological dropping of syllables featuring an /l/. BuddhKat and three medical texts in Brāhmī have käräk instead of kärgäk, while even very late texts in Uygur script practically always write kärgäk. käräk is also what we find in Qarakhanid sources and also as a loan word in Mongolian, already in the (13th century) Secret History. Rather than pointing at a different dialect, such traits show that texts in Indic scripts stayed outside the written norm and reflected characteristics of the spoken language; the g of kärgäk probably dropped away from the dialect(s) underlying Uygur already in the 10th century.

As for the syntactic characteristics of Brāhmī sources, these appear to emanate from the fact that some of them follow the syntactic structure or just the word order of their source text, and sometimes even its morphological structures rather slavishly. Unusual syntax need not, on the other hand, always be the result of direct copying even in translated texts. In Christian texts, for instance (e.g. the first text in U I or the Christian one in ChrManMsFr), the finite verb is less often at the end of the sentence than in other sources and relativisation is more right-branching with conjunctional particles than left-branching with participles. These features may, however, also have been characteristic of spoken language, Central Asian Christians possibly being less bound by the written norms of mainstream society.

---

34 Late Sanskrit, the source of some of these texts, is prone to extensive compounding; moreover, it expresses even predicates in a preponderantly nominal manner.
In general, the degree of the slavishness with which Uygur texts follow their sources is a parameter worth watching in all texts. However, quite a number of Uygur texts are not translations but ad hoc communications (e.g. letters); others are original creations or paraphrases (expansions or summaries), and even translations often contain interpolations and alterations of the translator.

Criteria for lateness are *apa* and *muqa* as datives of *ol* ‘that’ and *bo* ‘this’ instead of *apar* and *mugar* (discussed in section 3.132); the introduction of helping vowels beside /l/ and metatheses mostly involving /l/ such as *ädräm* < *ärdäm* ‘virtue’ (section 2.406); the appearance of *idi* ‘master’ as *iä* or *igä*; the change *yarîgka* ‘to command etc.’ > *yarîlka*; the change of the causative formative from -*X* to -*It* (section 3.212) and the change of the vowel in the converb and aorist suffixes used with this formative from /I/ to /U/ (see section 3.233 and especially Erdal 1979b and 1986 for this and for the next item); change in other aorist forms such as *âlit-îr* ‘he/she leads’ > *el(l)tîr, bil-îr* > *bilîr, al-îr* > *alur, ögîr-îr* > *ögîrür* etc.; the change from accusative to nominative when postpositions govern nouns with possessive suffixes or pronouns (section 4.21); the replacement of the accusative suffix *(X)g* by its pronominal counterpart +*nI* (section 3.124); the regularisation in the negative conjugation found in -*mAcI* (future) > -*mAAdAcI* and -*mAdOk* (perfect and evidential) > -*mAmlî* (section 3.232); *kârgâk* ‘need’, *âsgâk* ‘donkey’ > *kârâk, âşyûk; *sA* as the conditional suffix (section 3.287); the change of the imperative particle from *gIl* to *gUl*; *birlâ* ‘with’ > *bîlî(n)* (section 3.32); *burun* ‘nose’ > ‘before’ (attested e.g. in *burun+kî* ‘earlier’ in Suv); counting by the higher decade replaced by counting by the lower decade (section 3.14), and *ayîg* ‘bad’ > *ayî* when used with the meaning ‘very’. One other conspicuous matter is the free alternation in late texts between *t* and *d*, *s* and *z* and, in the scripts where it can be observed, *k* and *g* replacing earlier (e.g. runiform) adherence to either the voiced or the unvoiced consonant.36 Doerfer 1993: 115-119 mentions that this phenomenon does not occur in Qarakhanid and explains why it must be

35 We take -*gUl* to have fused from -*gU ol*, a marker of impersonal mood, but in some of its instances it appears in parallelism with *gIl*; the matter is not completely clear.

36 As Zieme 1969: 23 notes in connection with the Pothi book where such confusions are especially prominent, they are referred to as ‘Mongolisms’ because they generally appear during Mongol domination (which is rather late as far as Old Turkic corpus is concerned); he does not, however, draw the conclusion that the Pothi book must be late. Occasional confusions such as *sägiz* for *säkiz* ‘eight’ in the Xw are called ‘irrtümliche Schreibungen’. Zieme explains their generally rare occurrence in Manichæan texts by the traditional care which the Manichæans showed in the production of mss.
due to contact with Mongolian and the way that language was written. These processes did not all occur simultaneously, nor did they all automatically apply to texts we know to have been late: Knowledge of the standard language clearly lingered on into Yuan times, to varying degrees with different individuals. We have already noted the rather early appearance of the truncated variant of the conditional suffix -sAr and of kärük as ‘necessity, necessary’ in the catechism in Tibetan writing. The fact that medical and astrological texts have such phenomena more than late religious texts shows that they mark progressiveness, suppressed when writing or copying something venerable.

What should be kept in mind in this connection is that the spelling of written texts, especially when adhering to a norm, rarely exactly reproduces one to one the pronunciation of the people who write them; fluctuations often reflect a conflict between the means put at the writer’s disposal by the writing system and how he thinks the words should be pronounced, as well as between his pronunciation and traditional spelling. If the London scroll in TT VI 89-90 shows thrice the spelling ärkligin yorïglï and once the spelling ärkligän yorïg lï, the chances are that the scribe thought that 1) consistence was not important, 2) neither spelling the word with alef nor spelling it with yød was fully appropriate for his purpose (which may or may not have been directly linked to what he would be pronouncing). We know from phonetic recordings that pronunciation can also fluctuate freely, but this is not the only determinant of spelling. Some of the traits thought to be phonic may be due to graphic fluctuations preceding standard spelling, or to texts outside the spelling traditions. Laut’s (1986) explanation for the inconsistent and uneven nature of the evidence is that the texts as we have them represent the result of alterations by copyists under the influence of their own dialect.37 I agree with this and have said as much in connection with the n > y process.

Uygur texts which have Arabic, New Persian or Mongolian loans or change /d/ to /y/ e.g. in kaygu < kadgu ‘sorrow’, kayït- < kadït- ‘to return (intr.)’ should not be considered to be part of the Old Turkic corpus: Proto-Turkic /d/ has been preserved as an alveolar in some Turkic languages to this day, so that the presence of the feature /yl/ < /d/ (when preceded by a vowel in the same stem or suffix) is a dialect

37 Pp.61-62. He thinks the changes were deliberate, arguing against R.R.Arat who considered them to be accidental. The correction from bašlug to bašlig visible in the ms. in Mait 73v20 is no proof, however, as the copyist may, in this particular case, have been trying to prevent a misunderstanding: baš+lig could have been misunderstood as bašla-g, which also exists.
characteristic no less than a sign of lateness: It is, in fact, documented as such already by Kāšgāri (fol. 289), who states that the Oğuz and Kıpčak say koy- instead of kod-. InscRouig, an Uygur inscription from the year 1334, is an example for a text which has Persian and Mongolian loans as well as this sound change.

Sources range from imperial inscriptions to personal letters sent to family members and graffiti scribbled by travellers on rocks. After the Mongol invasion, the differences between the language of texts intended for public and especially for religious use and that of the private documents grew, the former being conservative and showing more of a dependence on foreign sources. For the period described, it appears that the progressive texts are quite close to the spoken language, the vital vehicle of an expanding society, quickly replacing the last vestiges of local Iranian and Tokharian vernaculars in all spheres of life. Stylistic differences and registers are discernible: Personal letters, medical texts and scribblings represent a colloquial language with consonants and morphology progressive in a few points, a few consonant elisions and word order even freer than otherwise. More formal language was, however, just as ‘real’ in its use. The distinction between registers does not, of course, apply only to an overall classification of sources, but also to the presentation of utterances within narrative texts, to the polite reference to the addressee in the plural, to lexical devices, to address verbs marked on the politeness scale and the like.

The texts show some code switching: When a stretch in a non-Turkic language is included in an Old Turkic text, we do not consider it to part of our corpus if it contains a predication, i.e. if it is a clause, a sentence or more. One example is the Parthian sentence Man āstar hirza „Forgive my sins!” repeatedly found in the Xwastānīft. This text is the Manichān confession prayer: pronouncing the sentence is part of a ritual and not meant to serve communication with humans. A similar case are dhāraṇīs (incantations) included in Buddhist texts, which make no sense in Uygur (and sometimes not in any other language either). Another situation arises when communicating individuals are bilingual in the same two languages; this makes switching possible from one into the other. Examples are the Turkic–Sogdian texts edited by Hamilton & Sims-Williams or Turkic–Chinese land sale contracts published recently. Code switching will be relevant for Old Turkic syntax in case

---

38 I see no reason to agree with Tenišev 1979 and scholars following his views on the matter, who think that the language spoken by the Old Turkic population is substantially different from their written language.
it happens within one sentence, if, e.g., a foreign clause is included in an Uygur sentence. Foreign stretches are not, in any case, relevant for Old Turkic phonology: The /h/ which we find in the Xnastvănîft formula, for instance, cannot be considered to be one of the Old Turkic phonemes. The situation is different for loan words: lenxwa 'lotus', e.g., was clearly used freely in Uygur; the onset /l/ and the cluster xw at the syllable onset must therefore have been within the competence of users of this language, at least for the register concerned, and assuming the word was pronounced as it was written.

In naming the Old Turkic corpus or parts of it, scholars’ practices sometimes differ from our formulation. For some, Old Turkic’ is only the language of the Orkhon inscriptions and does not include any Uygur or even the runiform inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire.39 Others group the texts of the A dialect together with the inscriptions, calling this ‘Türkü’ or ‘Türküt’. Some exclude Qarakhanid from Old Turkic, assigning it instead to Middle Turkic. The view that the variants of Old Turkic as listed above should be taken to be alike unless explicitly shown to be different has become the standard among scholars specialising in Old Turkic. This view is not shared by all scholars, however: In his (1980) review of Tekin 1968, e.g., Benzing proposed that the verb okî- ‘to call etc.’ should in Orkhon Turkic be read as okkî- because the velar retains its voicelessness in the northwestern Turkic languages (where single voiceless consonants become voiced between vowels). No Uygur source writes okkî-, however, although Uygur does not follow the Orkhon Turkic practice of spelling geminates as single consonants: Benzing did not consider the possibility that Proto-Turkic may have had *okki- and that the geminate could have been simplified in Old Turkic including Orkhon Turkic. This was not necessarily the case and the Orkhon Turkic verb may indeed have been pronounced with a geminate, left implicit in the writing. This would mean transporting Proto-Turkic into Old Turkic, however, and I think scholarship should better assume coherence among the (rather close) dialects of Old Turkic in every matter for which the data do not prove it to be otherwise. The present work tries, among other things, to provide such distinguishing data; that, e.g. -yOk is not used in runiform inscriptions, used in the Manichaean texts just as participle and put to general use only in Buddhist texts. This type of remark, or the reference to phenomena as ‘late’ or ‘early’, are scattered throughout the work. The

39 Thus e.g. Johanson 1979 : 8. The fact is that none of the sub-corpuses is really homogeneous.
discovery of relevant features for Old Turkic text classification is still going on, and we have not attempted any synthesis on this topic here.

1.3. History of research

1.3.1. Sources

We can look back to more than one century of research into Old Turkic, initiated by W. Radlov's edition in 1891 of the QB ms. in Uygur writing and especially by W. Thomsen's decipherment of the runiform script in 1893. Runiform inscriptions had been discovered by travelers to Siberia centuries earlier, and then by Fins exiled to that country and by Russian archeologists; they were made accessible to the scholarly world in 1892, through drawings and facsimiles in Finnish and Russian publications. In the first 50 years of research, runiform inscriptions were edited by Thomsen himself, by W. Radlov, S.E. Malov, G.J. Ramstedt and others. Orkun 1936-41 is a collected reedition of all this material. A great many short runiform inscriptions were then discovered or rediscovered, edited or reedited in the Soviet Union, mostly by D.D. Vasil'ev, I.L. Kyzlasov, S.E. Kljaštornyj and I.V. Kormušin. Lists of runiform inscriptions can be found in Vasil’ev 1976/78 and Sertkaya 1984.

The Uygur corpus of Old Turkic was made available by Russian, Japanese, German, British, French and Swedish expeditions to East Turkestan and Gansu, the greatest number of mss. reaching Germany. The writing itself was known in the West at least since Klaproth 1820. The task of editing the sources discovered since the turn of the century is still going on, the first editors being F.W.K. Müller, A. v. le Coq, W. Bang, V. Thomsen, W.W. Radlov, P. Pelliot and G.J. Ramstedt. Between 1920 and 1970, Uygur texts were edited foremost by A.v. Gabain, and also by S.E. Malov, G.R. Rachmati (subsequent name R.R. Arat), T. Haneda, M. Mori, N. Yamada and Ş. Tekin. In recent decades the activity of editing Uygur mss. (mostly in Germany, but also in Japan, France, Turkey, the Soviet Union, the United States, China and Finland) expanded greatly; published dictionaries (see below)

---

40 The ms. edited by Radloff is actually the latest of the three existing mss. of this source and shows certain characteristics of Middle Turkic. Even this ms. is, however, certainly closer to Old Turkic than Chagatay sources, which Thomsen and other scholars otherwise had as guidance for their texts.

41 Scholars are listed more or less in the order of their importance in this domain.

42 Order of listing again by approximate volume of activity. I don’t see much point in
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simplified the work, knowledge of the language was deepened, texts were routinely published together with their facsimiles and a growing number of source texts was identified. The publication of facsimiles is becoming less necessary as the great majority of Uygur sources is now becoming accessible on the internet.

C. Brockelmann and B. Atalay contributed much to the constitution and interpretation of the DLT, the former writing several papers on various aspects of this source and presenting its lexical material in dictionary form, the latter editing the text and publishing it with index and facsimile. R.R. Arat edited (1947) the three extant mss. of the QB in what attempts to be a critical edition of this extensive source. Dankoff & Kelly (1982-85) presented the definitive re-edition of the Turkic elements in the DLT, translating the Arabic matrix text into English; Dankoff’s (1983) translation of the QB is, in many points, a highly successful reinterpretation of the text.

1.32. The Lexicon

Most Uygur texts published until the 1970s were accompanied by glossaries. Brockelmann 1928 is an index to the DLT, an invaluable source for our knowledge of the Old Turkic lexicon in general. This work was useful for scholars working on Uygur and inscriptive sources, though based mostly on the faulty edition of Kilisli Rifat (1917-1919). This makes it inferior to Atalay’s glossary to his re-edition, which itself is now superseded by vol. 3 of Dankoff & Kelly 1982-85. The year 1931 saw the appearance of the Analyytischer Index by Bang & Gabain, which unites the (corrected) lexical material of TT I-V and of two other texts edited by the authors. Caferoğlu 1934 is the first dictionary to unite the material of all the Uygur sources (including runiform mss.); its second edition (1968) includes Uygur material published till 1964. The fourth volume of H.N. Orkun’s Eski Türk Yazıtları and the first edition of Gabain’s Alttürkische Grammatik both appeared in 1941. The former covers all runiform lexical material (including proper names and uninterpreted strings of signs), while the latter’s
giving a full list of editors; see the index of the UW for their names and publications. The most prolific editor is probably P. Zieme, who is in charge of this task at the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences.

43 Religious Uygur texts, which are the majority, are normally translations, reformulations, expansions etc. of texts in other languages; Chinese, Indic, Iranian or Tokharian if the text is Buddhistic, Iranian if it is Manichaean, Iranian or Syriac if it is Christian.
glossary is meant to be a listing of all understood lexemes both in Uygur and inscriptional Old Turkic. The first dictionary attempting to bring together the lexicon of the whole of Old Turkic as defined in the present work (i.e. also including Qarakhanid Turkic) was Nadeljaev et al. 1969 (the DTS). Clauson 1972 (the EDPT) has the same scope; both books only cover publications which appeared till the early 1960s, in spite of their publication dates. The EDPT is more sophisticated (e.g. in dealing with the QB) and more internally consistent than the DTS and is also useful in quoting Middle and Modern Turkic evidence for the entries as well as related Mongolian forms, including reference to the TMEN etc.; it is, on the other hand, weaker on phraseology, disregards (unlike the DTS) most borrowings into Old Turkic and is, furthermore, sometimes prone to unwarranted ‘emendations’ to the text. These two works supersede Caferoğlu’s and Orkun’s lexicons. Arat’s İndeks to the QB (1979), in fact mostly the work of students after his death, contains lexical material from this text which is only partly included in the EDPT and the DTS, but it must be used together with Tezcan 1981. Six fascicles have until now appeared of Röhrborn 1977-1998 (the UW), the most recent Old Turkic dictionary. It has, to date, only covered one letter and a half, but is highly dependable, exhaustive as far as Uygur is concerned and valuable also because the numerous passages quoted for context are reinterpretations reflecting present understanding. The OTWF, finally, can also serve for lexical documentation, mostly of derived lexemes. The Old Turkic lexicon is, then, still incompletely accessible in dictionary form, although the situation is vastly better in this domain than (hitherto) with the grammar.

1.33. Grammar

When Radlov and Thomsen worked on the runiform inscriptions which they published in 1895 and 1896 respectively, understanding their grammar appears not to have been a very difficult task for them: The difference between Old Turkic and modern Turkic languages is not greater than that which we find between the Turkic languages for which there already existed good descriptions at the time: the work of Kazem-Bek, Castrén, Radlov or Böhtlingk, not to speak of the many grammars

---

44 It covers only Uygur mss. excluding the runiform ones among them, but includes the few inscriptions in Uygur script. Since our knowledge of Old Turkic advances continuously, it is natural for details in the UW to need revision already while getting published; this is often done in subsequent fascicles.
of Ottoman which were readily available. Radlov published his *Grammatische Skizze der alttürkischen Inschriften* already in 1897. The first western scholars dealing with particular aspects of Old Turkic were concerned with the sound system; cf. Foy 1900 and V. Grønbech 1902 on the vowels. The earliest linguistic arguments on Old Turkic were those between Thomsen and Radlov and concerned the consonants: Radlov thought these should be read as in today’s South Siberian languages. This was denied by Thomsen (1901; text of a lecture held in 1897), whose opinion found wide acceptance; Thomsen’s argument was based on the QB, a Qarakhanid source. When Uygur mss. were discovered around the turn of the 20th century, they were immediately seen to have been written in the ‘same language’ as the runiform inscriptions, though in a different dialect (or different dialects). Thomsen, Müller, Le Coq, Bang and others occasionally dealt with points of Old Turkic phonology and morphology in notes to text editions, when some suffix needed an explanation: It was only natural for scholars to put their linguistic abilities under the service of text interpretation and philology and to concentrate their endeavours on making a corpus available to the public before proceeding to grammatical syntheses. The first publications devoted to the language of the Old Turkic sources in general are Foy 1904 (on the fragments in Manichaean writing) and Radlov 1909-1912. In the numerous papers which Bang published between 1896 and 1934 on various text passages or on comparative Turkic grammar, he sometimes expresses ideas concerning Old Turkic morphology (e.g. on the collective nominals in *+AgU* and on the onomatopoeic verbs in Bang 1919); however, these get lost among his endeavours to prove dubious hypotheses concerning proto-language. The only other monograph studies which Old Turkic scholars of the first generation devoted to language were Thomsen 1913-18 and 1916 on inscriptive matters, le Coq’s ‘Kurze Einführung in die uigurische Schriftkunde’ (1919; to this day the only Uygur paleography) and two papers by Brockelmann (1919 and 1921) on linguistic aspects of the DLT.

Beside A.v. Gabain, whose *Alttürkische Grammatik* dates from 1941, Bang had several Tatar students who presented general Turkic dissertations, later emigrated to Turkey and founded philological Turcology in that country:45 G.R. Rachmati (also Rachmutullin; in Turkey R.R. Arat), S. Schakir, (later S. Ishaki, in Turkey S. Çağatay)

---

45 Before these, Turkish Turcology had been mainly limited to Ottoman studies. The founder of the study of the history of the Turkic peoples in Turkey is Z.V. Togan, also a Tatar.
and the younger A. Temir. Rachmati's dissertation (on auxiliary verbs and converbs in Altay Turkic, published in 1928) was fully linguistic, but his significant contribution to Old Turkic studies remains within the domain of philology; an important late (1963) paper documents and describes orientational terminology. Schakir's dissertation (1933) on word formation also covers Old Turkic, and three papers of hers (1940-41 and 1943 respectively) deal with Uygur. Gabain continued to publish on Old Turkic grammar (1940, 1940a, 1950, 1950a, 1957, 1964, 1970 on selected topics and the general description in PhTF I in 1959), but her interest gradually shifted away from the texts and their language; her editing activity also ended in 1958. Temir published papers on Uygur particles (1949, 1956). K. Grønbech (the son of V. Grønbech and a student of V. Thomsen) and A. Salonen were the first to deal with grammatical categories and some aspects of the syntax of Old Turkic in a general linguistic context (1936 and 1937 respectively).

Németh 1939, Mansuroğlu 1957 and K. Thomsen 1957 (K. Grønbech's student) all deal with the origin and nature of Turkic /e/ as distinct both from /ä/ and /i/ (but not necessarily from /ä:/); cf. also Doerfer 1994. This topic is highly relevant even now, as none of the alphabets used for writing Old Turkic has a special character for this phoneme; its existence is therefore sometimes still contested.

Gabain 1957 deals with another matter which brought about some discussion: the so-called 'connective vowels', thought by many to have been reduced vowels introduced to 'help pronunciation'; cf. Erdal 1979a, Doerfer 1981-82 and 1993a and Erdal 1996. The traditional view (presented e.g. in Gabain 1941/1950/1974) is that they followed fourfold high harmony (i / ï / ü / u), but Doerfer (and, following him, Johanson – still in Johanson 2001) have, in a number of publications, argued that these are reduced low vowels (alü). Doerfer 1993a would like to see these introduced into the transcription of runiform sources.

Kowalski 1949 explores an interesting aspect of Old Turkic grammar (as of that of some modern Siberian languages), touching both upon verb formation and syntax: the causative of transitive verbs, whose meaning can get close to that of a passive. Röhrborn 1972, Nigmatov 1973, Johanson 1974, Kormuš in 1976 and the OTWF have contributed to the clarification of this topic.

In 1953 there appeared E.R. Tenišeŭ’s ‘Avtoreferat’ of his thesis on Uygur grammar based on the (Radlov–Malov edition of the translation of the) Svārumaprabhāśa. As far as I have been able to discover, this is the first paper since the work of Radlov dealing with the Old Turkic language to appear in the Russian empire and the Soviet Union. Nor
were any Uygur mss. edited there after a publication by S.E. Malov (the student of W. Radlov) in 1932 (as distinct from editions of inscriptions, which did go on). The reason for this gap may have been the fact that Soviet scholars were already busy enough describing the modern Turkic languages spoken in their realm, that such activity seemed more useful and that western scholarship was practically inaccessible to Soviet scholars. Moreover Tenišev, one of the most fruitful Turkologists working on modern languages, wrote only one more paper on Old Turkic (in 1971, proposing an explanation for the replacement of $\delta$ by $\xi$ in the runiform inscriptions). Research in this domain was taken up by other Soviet scholars in the late fifties; we find papers by V.M. Nasilov (1958, on nominals), A.S. Amanžolov (1959 and 1963 on the government of derived and analytical verb forms), D.M. Nasilov (1960 on periphrastic modal constructions and 1966 on the form in -yOk), M.Š. Širalijev (1960 on the etymology of the gerund suffix -XbAn), V.G. Kondrat'ev (1961 on the function of the form in -dOk in runiform sources) and Šukurov (1965 on the form in -gAlIr). Axmetov 1969, finally, deals with the whole verbal system of the runiform inscriptions. All this work, we find, is related to morphology and grammatical categories. Then we have Ajdarov 1969 on auxiliary words in the Orkhon inscriptions. Borovkova 1966 broached a phonological topic with her paper on the labial consonants in Qarakhânid Turkic.

Scientific discussions taking place in the West were, in those years, mainly concerned with vowels. The discussions around /e/ and around the ‘connective vowels’ hypothesis which started rather early have already been mentioned. One further vowel problem causing some stir was the question of whether Old Turkic had long vowels; several modern languages have such vowels in inherited Turkic stems and we know that Proto-Turkic already had them, but evidence for Old Turkic is uncertain. Cf. on this question Tuna 1960, Tekin 1967 and Tekin 1975 (reedition 1995a); the problem is discussed also in some general treatises, e.g. in Zieme 1969. Another question concerns the nature of vowels in non-first syllables: Are there the same number of phonemes as in first syllables or are there a smaller number of ‘archphonemes’? Does o奥林 appear in non-first syllables outside Brähmi texts? Are o and ð in non-first syllables allophones of other (high or low) vowels appearing only after o or ð or are they phonemes? Cf. for this topic Clauson 1962, K. Thomsen 1963, Clauson 1966 and Erdal 1996. Clauson 1962 was of course also concerned with a number of other aspects of the language, such as word structure, word formation etc.; in a sense this is preparatory work for the EDPT. Clauson 1966, on the
other hand, again limits itself to phonological matters. Pritsak 1961 can be be considered to be obsolete though still quoted in Johanson 1979. Meyer 1965 discovered the rules which apply for the explicit spelling of vowels in the Orkhon inscriptions, and partly also in other runiform texts; more attention to this paper would have prevented many a misled interpretation of those sources.

PhTF I, a handbook bringing together descriptions of most Turkic languages, appeared in 1959. Gabain's account of Old Turkic presented there is basically a summary of the grammar in Gabain 1941; Mansuroğlu wrote the chapter on Qarakhanid. Pritsak 1963, another short account of the whole corpus, is quite undependable. To this day, Gabain 1941 has remained the standard grammar of the language; it reappeared, with a few additions and corrections, in 1950 and again in 1974. In Russia, meanwhile, short general descriptions of the corpuses were presented by A.M. Ščerbak (1961, dealing with Old and Middle Turkic as if these were a single language) and V.M. Nasilov (1961 on the runiform inscriptions and 1963 on Uygur). Then came Ajdarov 1966 on the language of the Köl Tegin inscription and Kondrat'ev 1970 on the whole Old Turkic corpus. Tekin 1968 and Ajdarov 1971 both describe the language of the Orkhon inscriptions, while Kononov 1980 describes the runiform sources as a whole. Tekin's work covers all grammatical domains of this small corpus in structuralist exhaustiveness and also presents a full concordance of the lexicon including proper names as well as new editions and translations of the texts. Zieme 1969, which is highly authoritative but remains unpublished, deals with the graphemics, the phonology and morphology (but not the syntax) of the whole corpus of Manichaean sources (part of which he published later). Concerning Qarakhanid there is a description of syntax by Abduraxmanov (1967), of the verbal system by Ercilasun (1984); Hacemosoğlu 1996 is a full (but rather superficial) account of Qarakhanid grammar. Erdal 1998a is the most recent and concise description of the language of the whole Old Turkic corpus while T.Tekin 2000 deals with the whole corpus of insessional and manuscript runiform sources (and not only with the Orkhon inscriptions, as its title would imply).

One question which has intrigued scientists and become the object of numerous publications is the origin of the runiform script. Hypotheses have stated either that it is of Semitic origin, that it comes from tribal

46 In spite of its name, this work deals not only with grammar and related matters but also contains an anthology, a dictionary and a large bibliography also covering many non-linguistic aspects of the early Turks' world.
marks (used on gravestones, for branding animals, to mark domain borders etc.) or that it comes from ideograms (e.g. the sign for šq looking like an arrow, ok in Turkic). This question and the literature on it (from before decipherment till this day, e.g. by Emre, Clauson, Tryjarski, Pritsak, Róna-Tas, Ščerbak and many others) will not be followed up in the present work. What we are interested in is the system of writing and its relationship to the sound system; two publications on this are Kormušin 1975 and Hovdaugen 1979. Vasil'ev 1983 is a book on runiform palaeography. Much about the runiform, Brāhmī and Tibetan writing systems can be found in Róna-Tas 1991; the chapters on the use made of the Tibetan and Khotanese Brāhmī scripts is especially important. Handbooks such as Gabain 1941 and Caferoğlu 1969 also have palæographical sections. The early palæography of Le Coq for the Uygur script has already been mentioned; cf. also Laut 1992. Moriyasu has done serious work on the diachronical palæography of the Uygur script, stating that what he calls the square style is found only in the pre-classical stage; the other three styles he posits are semi-square, semi-cursive and cursive, which is always late.

For the phonological domain cf. Doerfer 1971. We already mentioned some of the work on the vowels of Old Turkic. Röhrborn 1996 is about synharmonism in foreign words. The introductions to BuddhKat (a text in Tibetan writing) and Maue 1996 contain valuable observations to the vowel system as emerging from these sources. Sims Williams 1981 should be basic reading for anyone dealing with the Old Turkic consonants. Among the consonants the labials were discussed by Borovkova 1966 and Hitch 1989, the alveolars by Maue 1983, the gutturals by Maue 1984 and Röhrborn 1988. Maue’s papers and Johanson 1979 reflect scholarly activity around the phonetic value of the Old Turkic consonants based mainly on the Brāhmī sources. The latter monograph propounds bold hypotheses also concerning a number of aspects of Orkhon Turkic (as stated in several reviews, among them Gabain 1982). In the runiform inscriptions, suffixes which have [š] in most modern languages are spelled with S, for which Tenišev (1971) tried to find an explanation. There is also a Manichaean ms. showing the same phenomenon, but Zieme (1969) thought that that was a mere orthographical matter. It has been noticed for some time that the opposition between /ŋ/ and /ɡ/ is weak, the latter often replacing the former in modern languages, in Orkhon Turkic (cf. e.g. Tekin 1968) and in the DLT (cf. the introduction to Dankoff & Kelly 1982-85). Hamilton 1977 pointed out that the replacement exists also in some Uygur texts connected with the city of Khotan. Doerfer 1995 deals with
the alternation \(i \sim y\)- in Old Turkic: The author had shown in his work on Khaladj that the phoneme /h/, which appears at the beginning of words in that language, must have its source in Proto-Turkic, and that it correlates with an unstable onset /y/ in Old Turkic. Here he proposes that /h/ be read in these words also in Old Turkic. The fact that the opposition between Proto-Turkic /r/ and /z/ is neutralized both in the Chuvash-Bolgar branch of Turkic and in the Mongol words corresponding to Turkic lexical or grammatical units with /z/ has occupied Altaistic research for some time. An apparently irregular alternation \(r \sim z\) exists also within Old Turkic, as described, among others, by T. Tekin (various publications), Xelimskij 1986 and the OTWF.

A number of scholars, a.o. Röhrborn, Laut, Maue, Shōgaito and Moriyasu, have in the last two decades dealt with the phonetic shape of Indic terms borrowed into Old Turkic; this reflects whether they came over Chinese, Tokharian or Sogdian, showing the immediate source of translations of Buddhist texts, the flow of cultural contacts and the degree of Sanskrit erudition of the translators and scribes.

W. Bang’s often adventurous contributions to word formation did not quite distinguish between etymology and this domain of grammar; indices to Bang’s voluminous work would be very welcome. Gabain 1941 and Räsänen 1957 generally do make this distinction but do not distinguish at all between deverbal nouns on the one hand, and participles on the other. Kobešavidze 1972 and the introductions to Schulz 1978 and OTWF (as already Erdal 1976) try to clarify this question. A systematic listing of formatives can be found in Clauson 1962. Schakir 1933 and Nigmatov 1971 both deal with denominal formation. OTWF might be said to supersede much of what preceded it in connection with word formation simply because it was based on a much wider material basis. One particular point of that work is corrected in Röhrborn 1995, which deals with the nominal use of ‘adjectives’. Doerfer 1982 gives examples for lexical units used as both nominals and verbs; that this is possible in Old Turkic grammar is denied in Erdal 1976/1991.

There are several relatively recent papers on Old Turkic case forms. Gabain 1970 constructs a distinction between primary case forms as the accusative, the instrumental and the genitive, and secondary case suffixes, whose juncture seems to be looser in Old Turkic. The genitive and the accusative forms are dealt with by Doerfer (1983 and 1990), who thinks that the form of nominals demanded by postpositions is not the accusative but an ‘oblique’ stem. T. Tekin 1991 and 1996a are
papers on Old Turkic case forms motivated by the Altaic hypothesis: The first (correctly) states that the Orkhon Turkic comitative is to be linked to a Mongolic case form and not to the suffix +lXg; the second tries (unacceptably, I think) to posit an Old Turkic dative-locative suffix +A parallel to the Mongolic suffix of the same shape (an idea adopted also by L. Bazin). Sertkaya 1992 describes the recursivity of case suffixes with pronouns, Erdal & Schönig 1990 the vowel alternation in the case forms of demonstrative pronouns. T.Tekin 1985 and Zieme 1992 deal with postpositions; the former paper is about üzä, in which the author finds the dative-locative suffix +A to which he returns (again) in 1996a. Barutçu 1992 deals with the elements kalit and nälök, both of pronominal origin and signifying 'how', which have very different functions. Moerlose 1986 is about the manifold functions of the element ulati, which is hard to assign to a part of speech; it is a conjunction only in some of its uses. Erdal 1991a deals with the Orkhon Turkic pragmatic particle gU, found also in some modern Turkic languages and in Mongolic. Ehlers 1983 discovered how the last decade of every hundred numerals is expressed in the counting system of early Old Turkic; Clark 1996 has a quite plausible theory on the source of that system.

The morphology of the verbal system is covered well by Zieme 1969 for Manichaean sources, T.Tekin 1968 for Orkhon Turkic, Ercilasun 1984 for the QB, by Brockelmann 1919 and Dankoff & Kelly 1982-85 for the DLT and Gabain 1974 for the rest. Erdal 1979b describes the distribution of the vowels of the converb and aorist suffixes in simple and derived verbs of inscriptive Turkic and Uygur, Erdal 1986 of Qarakhânid Turkic; T.Tekin 1995 shows how some of these are explained through Mongolian. Eraslan 1980 describes the verbal nominals of Old Turkic, while T.Tekin 1997 focuses on -dOk. Röhrborn 1993 tries to delimit the border between the nominal and the verbal domain; Röhrborn 1998a proposes är-gäy as etymology for the particle ärki. Šervašidze 1978 deals with analytical verb forms in the runiform inscriptions, Tekin 1996 with two such constructions; cf. also the introduction to Schönig 1996. Šervašidze 1979, Telicin 1987 and Johanson 1988 are about Old Turkic converbs.

Syntax is a relative newcomer to Old Turkic studies; what we find in Gabain 1941 is morphocentric and rather erratic. Schinkewitsch 1926, although dealing primarily with the language of (early Middle Turkic) Rabghûzî, refers to syntactic aspects of Qarakhânid, Uygur and Orkhon Turkic sources as well and is also important for the way he views
Turkic syntactic problems. Abduraxmanov 1967 and Nigmatov 1975a are general descriptions of Qarakhanid syntax; there is nothing similar for Old Turkic proper.

The first papers I could discover on specific syntactic topics are Ş. Tekin 1965 on oblique clauses and Poppe 1966 on nominal phrases and nominal compounds: this latter is the topic also of Adams 1981 and Röhrborn 1987. Both Adams and Kayra 1994, who deals with adjectives and adjective phrases, limit their paper to the Orkhon inscriptions; by far the greatest volume of linguistic and philological research has been carried out on this group of texts, although it constitutes only a minute fraction of Old Turkic sources. Uygur uses the suffix +iXg to form nominal phrases with metaphorical content. These structures were first described by Erdal 1976; in 1981 this description was presented at a symposium organised by C. Röhrborn, who published only a greatly abbreviated version of the paper in 1982. Röhrborn himself dealt with the same topic in the 1980 volume of MT, which came out in 1983 (Röhrborn 1983b). The 1976/1981 text finally appeared in print as part of OTWF. Röhrborn 1983a is about the syntactic behaviour of Indic loans. Nigmatov 1975 describes the semantic and syntactic functions of Qarakhanid case forms.

Old Turkic verbal government is the topic of Amanžolov 1969, while Kuznecov 1971 describes clauses formed with -doK in the inscriptions. Johanson on Turkic “hypotaxis” (1975) and on Turkic converb clauses (1995) is concerned also with Old Turkic. Schulz 1978 is a doctoral thesis on Old Turkic adjunct clauses. Tuguševa 1986 is an overview of nominal sentences with the pronoun ol as topic or comment. Subaşı Uzun 1995 wrote a text grammar of the Orkhon inscriptions. Erdal 1998b, finally, is about diachronic syntax: It shows how the early Old Turkic so-called ‘construction of two subjects’ brought about the adnominal nominative construction.

The use of much of the work mentioned is relatively limited, as it does not take the very substantial text editions of the last thirty years into consideration; this is especially true of the Soviet Union, where western publications got known with delays of up to a decade. In many domains of Old Turkic grammar, Gabain 1974 is still the last word. It can be considered to approximate adequacy only in morphology. Much has to be added even in that domain, as some phenomena happen to have first come up in texts which appeared more recently. Many questions about the sound system are still open and partly have to be given tentative answers; for a number of areas (especially in syntax) the description offered below is a first attempt.
1.34. Dialectology and language change

Since the beginnings of research into Old Turkic it was clear that there are a lot of similarities and also some dissimilarities between the language of the different corpuses mentioned in section 1.2. Gradually it also became clear that there were some differences within these corpuses, both among classes of Uygur texts and among runiform inscriptions, whether due to dialect, historical development, different sources or style. Bang & Gabain wrote in 1929 in a note to TT I 151-152 that there are dialects within Uygur: Referring to what they read as the diminutives *ašnuška* and *amtikšna* in that passage, they state that earlier Old Turkic *ñ* became *n* in Manichaean texts which, as they thought, were mostly written by Oguz Turks, but *y* in most other, mainly Buddhist texts. In the n. to l. 1826 of her *Briefe der uigurischen Hüentsang-Biographie*, which appeared in 1938 (p. 367-369 in SEddT-F), Gabain set out her views on this topic in greater detail and with a number of characteristics: She now distinguished three dialects, the *n* dialect, the *y* dialect (for the distinction of which she adduced further criteria) and the dialect of the Brāhmī mss., adding a short list of sources said to belong to the *n* dialect. She rightfully stressed that the dialects mix these characteristics (a point also made by Hazai & Zieme 1970: 132, Gabain 1974: 3-8, Schulz 1978: XIII-XVII and Laut 1986: 61), but thought that they predominate one way or the other in all texts, making classification into the two groups possible.

Recent discussion on the question of Uygur dialects was initiated by Zieme 1969: 173-182 (published with slight alterations as the second part of Hazai & Zieme 1970), who gives detailed information on all (published and at that time as yet unpublished) Manichaean sources available to him concerning a number of points and lists some linguistic criteria likely to distinguish between dialects as found in mss. clusters. Batmanov 1971 tries to find correlations between Old Turkic dialects and modern Turkic languages; in this connection it may be mentioned that Doerfer 1975-76 and 1975-76a state the language of the Orkhon inscriptions to be the earliest stage of Oguz Turkic. In the EDPT Clauson (1972; xiii ff.) distinguished between “Türkii”, which he

---

47 The question of the development of early Old Turkic /ñ/ is taken up in section 2.33. There is a contradiction in Bang & Gabain’s statement on TT I as this text is not, in fact, Manichaean. In the UW, these instances are reinterpreted as instrumental case forms of *+kluA*, i.e. *ašnuš(i)yən* and *amtikšyən* respectively, while Röhrborn 1981-82: 298 reads *ašnušə* and *amtikšə*. That some Manichaean texts show similarities with the language of the runiform inscriptions had already been noticed by W. Radloff in 1908.
conceived of as including Orkhon Turkic as well as runiform mss. and Manichæan texts retaining /ñ/ such as the Xw, and two distinct “but closely related” Uygur dialects, “Uygur” and “Uygur-A”. The EDPT’s ‘Uygur’ covers not only what is generally called by this name but also the runiform inscriptions inscribed in Mongolia during the Uygur Steppe Empire; Uygur-A was defined by the lowering of high vowels referred to in section 1.2. Kondrat’ev 1973, Tuguševa 1974, Tenišev 1976 and Blagova 1977 discuss the differences between Orkhon Turkic and Uygur and try to answer the question whether these are dialects or different languages.

Erdal 1976: 10-48 (published with minor changes as Erdal 1979) dealt with a set of linguistic characteristics of Old Turkic diachrony as distinct from external characteristics such as palæography, content, explicit dating or the appearance of the document (e.g. whether it is a ms. or a block-print, the latter appearing only under Mongol domination in the 13th century). The paper lists a number of linguistic criteria which can serve for placing texts into older or younger strata of the language, while Zieme 1981 and Bazin 1991 are concerned with extra-linguistic dating. Erdal 1979 thought that the appearance of the runiform letter ñ or the spelling NY in other writing systems is older than the change of /ñ/ to /n/ or /y/ though Zieme 1969: 173-182 had already stated that Manichæan texts could have a fluctuation between NY and N. Röhrborn 1983 thought that fluctuations should be taken to be merely graphic. He suggested they should not be seen as a critical criterion for classifying texts, the Maitrisimit consistently having ñ > y but, on the other hand, most of the other criteria for including it into one group with the texts which either write NY or N for /ñ/. In a text showing both NY spellings and N or Y variants instead of that, the N or Y instances should, he proposes, like NY also be read as [ñ]. The same premiss could also lead one to the opposite conclusions: That the scribe knew the words were supposed to be pronounced with [ñ] but let his own pronunciation, which was [y], interfere with spelling which reflected conservative practice. Other scholars have also thought about this free alternation: Hamilton (in a note to KP) wondered whether there was dialect mixing; below we quote the opinions of Arat and Laut on the question.

Tenišev 1979 developed the theory, subsequently found reiterated by a number of Soviet scholars like also Kondrat’ev 1981, that Old Turkic was a written language which was wholly distinct from the languages and dialects actually spoken by the scribes: These latter could, he thought, have been closer to the earlier stages of modern languages. Erdal 1985 shows that alternants existing side by side in the QB and
chosen for the sake of poetical form are, in fact, real regressive and progressive variants which can be taken to have both existed one beside the other in spoken language.

Important contributions on the history of the Buddhist Uygur corpus came from Şahgaito 1982, who showed that a small early group of Buddhist texts which were linguistically close to Manichaean sources had Buddhist terminology in Sogdian rather than in Tokharian garb, i.e. that there was a correlation between the path of borrowing and the linguistic shape of the Old Turkic texts themselves, and from Röhrborn 1983. Şahgaito thought the spelling of high vowels as low ones in pre-classical texts together with the frequent omission of these vowels meant that they were pronounced short. This hypothesis (which seems plausible) is quite distinct from the ‘helping vowels’ hypothesis, as it does not refer only to suffix vowels, and not only to fourfold harmony vowels (which are not, after all, the only ones affected). Maue & Röhrborn 1984-85: Teil II 77-79 stated that differences conceived of as being dialectal in fact represent different stages of development. On a distinction between pre-classical and classical Buddhist Uygur texts based on orthography, types of loan words and some less linguistic criteria see especially Laut 1985 and 1986: 59-88. These interpret some distinctive characteristics of Zieme 1969 and Erdal 1979 as well as one or two others as indications of language change and not of dialects. Laut embedded his ideas in history: It was the Sogdians who first introduced the Turks to Buddhism in the 6th century. Those who, in the second half of the 8th century, not only brought Manichaism to the Uygur Turks when they still had their steppe empire in Mongolia, but also got them into adopting this as their state religion and had the first texts translated were also Sogdians. More recently, Moriyasu has come up with a tripartite chronological classification of mss. based on Uygur paleography. As proven by Moriyasu 1990, the Uygurs were actually converted to Buddhism through the efforts of Chinese and Tokharians when, vanquished by the Kürdüt in 840, they moved into the Tarim basin and got into intensive contact with the Tokharians; all major early Uygur Buddhist texts are translations from Tokharian. Doerfer 1993 combined 30 different criteria but simplifies and distorts matters a little; cf. the reviews of Tekin 1994 and Zieme 1994. New

---

48 However, an important element in the argument of Laut 1986: 6 has subsequently proved to be groundless: The word understood as saṅgha ‘Buddhist community’ in the Sogdian Bugut inscription, dated to around 580 A.D., has now been shown to be the Iranian word for ‘stone’ (i.e. stele), saṅ in Persian. The content of the inscription points towards a quite different religious orientation, an ancestor cult.
research taking numerous texts published during the last decade into consideration as well as the theories of the 1980s (which Doerfer did only to a limited extent) would be highly welcome.
CHAPTER TWO

GRAPHEMICS, SPELLING, PHONOLOGY AND MORPHOPHONOLOGY

The graphic and phonic component of Old Turkic is here presented in the tradition of European structuralism, which uses abstract phonemes as phonological units. Phonemes consist of sets of equally abstract allophones, whose alternation is conditioned by the phonic context. Such context can also let phonemes alternate among themselves, neutralising oppositions between them. Families of phonemes alternating under such neutralisation are called archphonemes. We assume that the graphic data of Old Turkic intend the representation of pronunciation; there is certainly no necessary one-to-one correspondence between graphemes (i.e. ‘letters’) or grapheme sequences and phonemes or allophones, but spelling choices made by the writer are not a priori taken to be arbitrary: Solid internal evidence has preference over historical, comparative or contact information.

2.1. Graphemics

Old Turkic was written in a great number of writing systems. Most sources use alphabets of ultimate Semitic origin, borrowed through Sogdian: The Manichean and Syriac scripts were used by Manicheans and Christians respectively; by far the most common was the Uygur script, used by adherents of all religions among the Turks of Eastern Turkestan. It is a variant of the Sogdian script, which, itself, was also put to limited use for Old Turkic. The Yarkand documents, which are Qaraghanid, are also in Uygur writing (though with Arabic characters as diacritics); Kägge lists the Uygur alphabet, calling it the alphabet of the Turks, but both the DLT and QB are written in the Arabic script, the vehicle of Islam. Indic scripts were used much less than the scripts coming from the West, the Khotanese variety of Brāhmī and the Tibetan script even less than Brāhmī script as used by the Tokharians.  

49 Tables showing the actual letters can be found in all the other handbooks dealing with Old Turkic.  
50 One of the three QB mss. is in Uygur writing; this is the latest among the mss., however, and there now seems to be no doubt that it is a secondary transcription.  
51 There also are a few Uygur seal imprints and one economical text in 'Phags-pa, a
The sources which use Indic scripts are of great linguistic value, however, as these scripts are highly explicit in their rendering of vowels. The original Turkic script is the one here named ‘runiform’; it was at first named ‘runic’ because it was thought to be akin to the Germanic runes before it was deciphered. Some of its characters look similar to ones found in early Semitic alphabets; this makes it likely that some such script (one used, for instance, in the Caucasus, where Turkic presence appears to have been quite early as well) was known to its creator(s). The inconsistencies and complications of the runiform script in the voiceless sibilant domain also strongly remind us of the Semitic languages. On the other hand, the fact that the vowels [a] or [ä] can be implicitly understood to be present throughout the word (though not at its end) when nothing is written explicitly are something which we know from Indic systems. However, the appearance of all other vowels in non-first syllables is also left implicit, if they are preceded by a vowel of the same class of backness / frontness and roundedness (though not necessarily equal in height). The runiform system is certainly not one of aksaras. It is not a syllabic system either, as some have maintained, although some characters have been transliterated as ‘k or as ‘k: These signs (to limit oneself here to these examples) cannot be interpreted only as signalling ‘uvular k preceded by o or u’ or ‘uvular k preceded by i’ respectively, since the vowel whose presence they imply can also follow them. Moreover, they can also be separated from this vowel by /l/ or /r/; thus e.g. yïl + ka is spelled as y’Iïk’A in Tariat E9, S1, 2, 3 and 5 and W2. Similarly, the well-known körk + lüg should in IrqB 18 and 64 not be read as ‘körüklüg’ just because it is spelled with the ‘k ligature; nor should Türk, attested since early times in very

writing system akin to the Tibetan one, invented for writing Mongolian; cf. Zieme 1998.

52 Doerfer in several places (also e.g. 1993: 119) states that whatever is implicit in runiform sources is either a / ã or ã / ã. This is in accordance with his view that /X/ was originally realised not as /i u ü o ö/ but as / å Æ/. In fact, however, it is not only /X/ or /X/ that remain implicit, but any vowel preceded by another vowel of its own class: yükündür- in KT E2 and BQ E3 or sökür- in KT E18 and BQ E16 are both spelled with only the first of their vowels made explicit, e.g., although the causative suffixes have the shape -dUr- and -Ur- respectively. See more on this below.

53 An aksara is a unit of writing of the numerous Indic alphabets. It consists of any consonant cluster (even one whose consonants belong to different syllables, e.g. tp, cch or ntr) + any subsequent vowel (including nasalised vowels and syllabic sonants).

54 E.g. Johanson 2001: 1724b. The table in T.Tekin 2000: 23 gives three characters the readings baš, düm and kii respectively; the first of these has, e.g., been read in Taryat N3 (twice) and 4. All these are rather arbitrary proposals and seem unlikely. See Erdal 2002: 64 footn. 38 for ‘düm’, which is probably merely a variant of d̜.
Moreover, we find the signs indicating both a consonant and a vowel to be used beside explicit vowel letters; e.g. $s^1w^2w^3ksw^3mls^2 = sokušmiš$, $t^1w^2w^3p^1 = tutupa$, $t^2w^2kl = tükäl$ in IrqB 2, 16 and 27 respectively. Tekin 2000: 33-36 lists Orkhon Turkic examples where $"k$, "$k$ and $'k$ are used beside explicit $w$, $w$ and $y$ respectively. Such spellings do not indicate vowel length, as some have thought, as they do not correspond to lengths known from Yakut, Turkmen etc.. All this means that the vowel + consonant signs serve only to show the quality of consonants when pronounced in the vicinity of particular vowel features; they are mere consonant letters and not syllabic in character. To sum up, this is an alphabetical system perhaps remotely betraying Semitic motivation. It appears that the runiform script was devised for writing Turkic or some other language showing a number of the typological traits characteristic of the Turkic group:

a) synharmonism and the presence of the front rounded vowels $ö$ and $ü$, both equally atypical of Semitic, Caucasian, East Asian and early Indo-European: The script distinguishes front and back harmony in rounded vowels and also in most consonants; there are, e.g., sets of very different-looking characters for front $b$ and back $b$, front $y$ and back $y$, and so forth; we transliterate these as $b^1$ and $b^2$ respectively. Semitic writing systems distinguish only between velar and uvular $/k/ ('k'$ and ‘$q'$) and $/g/ (often noted $g$ and $γ$ respectively), a distinction which has been used for expressing synharmonism in Turkic languages.

b) no expression of tones, as, e.g., in Chinese.

c) a preponderance of closed syllables as against open ones, unlike Chinese or Japanese: Alphabetical writing systems can be divided into 1) such that have an explicit expression of vowels in the same chain as

55 Ms. Mz 386 (TM 333) r2-3 has another instance of $körk$ spelled with "$k$ after the $İt$, wrongly written as $k^2$ in P. Zieme’s reedition of the fragment in ‘A Manichæan - Turkic dispute ...’ p.217. The word in r1 of the same fragment cannot, however, be read as $‘körüksüz’$ and be translated as “ugly”: What the ms. has is not $k^2w^2w^3k^1 s^2w$, as both Zieme and Sertkaya before him write, but $b^2w^2w^3k^1 s^2w$; the first character is a bit damaged but can clearly be seen to be $b^2$.

56 A more correct term widely used in Russian Turcology for what is usually (and often in this work as well) called vowel harmony. Harmony does not affect only vowels but consonants as well (though writing systems used for the Turkic languages reflect this fact less than they might).

57 $y$ is a palatal consonant, which sometimes fronts vowels beside it. The fact that the system provides for a back [$y$] shows that it is necessarily not meant to serve phonetics only, but also the characterisation of syllables as functioning in supra-segmental (morpho-)phonological context.
the consonants, e.g. the Greek alphabet and the ones descended from it or the Germanic runes; 2) aksara systems, in which signs for consonants (or even consonant clusters) are kernels around which vowel (or other) signs are obligatorily clustered, in Indian or Ethiopian alphabets; finally, 3), systems in which the writing of a consonant also implies the presence of a vowel beside it, though vowels can also, optionally, be expressed explicitly. Such implicit vowels follow the consonant in systems used for writing Semitic or Indic languages, the character for *t* also being used to note sound sequences such as *ta* or *ti*; the runiform system is alone in this third group in implying preceding vowels, such as *at* or *ut*, when merely writing *t* and not vowels following the consonant. This trait of the runiform system is incompatible also with the root principle in the lexicon, characteristic both of Semitic and early Indo-European. All coda vowels, on the other hand, are written out as separate characters (again unlike the Semitic and Indic systems).

d) A binary distinction of non-nasal consonants at each point of articulation, whether it be called voiced vs. voiceless, strident vs. mellow or stop vs. continuant etc.; most of early Indo-European has a threefold system, Sanskrit a fourfold one and Semitic as well as Caucasian languages have even more complex distinctions. Such characteristics might also be connected with other Altaic languages or with Uralic, but not a single inscription or ms. has as yet been found to bear a runiform text in any of those languages.\(^{58}\)

e) Such signs as *y*¹, which looks like the half full moon (*ay*), *ʺk*, which looks like an arrow (*ok*) or *b*², which has the shape of a tent (*āb/āv* ‘house, home’) seem to have an ideogrammatic background in Turkic (and not, e.g., in Mongolic).

f) The fact that the runiform alphabet was put to popular use in a vast area (including quite remote Siberian regions) coinciding with the roaming grounds of the early Turks, and not outside them, would equally speak for an original creation; the Tangut and Qitañ, e.g., have also invented their own writing systems.

Although the runiform script is thus likely to have been devised by Turkic groups, the Türk empires which formed in Mongolia probably first used the Sogdian–Uy̦gur alphabet, because they were introduced to sedentary civilisation by the Sogdians.\(^{59}\) The use of the runiform script

---

\(^{58}\) A few runiform ms. texts are in Middle Iranian languages; they were apparently written by Manichæan Uy̦gurs.

\(^{59}\) See e.g. Laut 1986: 5-7. The first draft of the Orkhon inscriptions may also have been written in Sogdian–Uy̦gur script: In KT N7 (though not in the parallel passage BQ
in the second Türk empire is no doubt to be seen as motivated by the return to the Turkic way of life as preached by Tuñökok in his inscription, which tried to neutralise the influence of foreign religions and cultures as much as possible. The original home (as distinct form the ultimate source) of this script may not have been in Mongolia but in South Siberia; there it was widely diffused and used by the population at large, as proven by grave inscriptions as well as some scribblings spread over a vast area.

The paleography of all of these scripts as used for Old Turkic will not be dealt with in this work, although what has been published on this topic till now is quite inadequate. For the time being, Gabain 1974: 9-41 (which also contains remarks on phonetics) can be consulted for a general survey, le Coq 1919 for Uygur writing, Róna-Tas 1991: 63-117 for the Brāhmī and Tibetan systems as applied to Old Turkic and Maue 1996: XV-XVIII specifically for Brāhmī. We will be referring to all of the scripts in transliteration, to all texts in transcription.

Old Turkic punctuation cannot be taken at face value; runiform punctuation has been studied but is still poorly understood; hardly any attention has been given to punctuating principles in Uygur texts (though the shape of punctuation marks is often referred to as a clue for the scribe’s affiliation). A future paleography will also have to document whether suffixes are linked to or separated from their stem in spelling (as done by a few text editors60); separation happens mostly in the nominal domain.

It is useful that the language we are investigating appears in so many different writing systems, as each one of them is inadequate in some ways or other; all of them leave some phonic qualities unexpressed or irregularly expressed even on the phonemic level. One therefore should not endeavour to base information about the sounds and the sound distinctions represented through a text by referring to that text alone. Rather, we have to turn to that writing system which is most adequate for each particular domain of phonology. We read the vowels of the runiform inscriptions as in Uygur, e.g., because Uygur has a much more elaborate rendering of vowels than the vast majority of runiform

E31, which was put to writing some time later) we find the passage bir uguš alpagu on ärig, which must be an error for bir uguš alpagut ärig as 1) bir uguš is a quantifier which makes on ‘ten’ superfluous, 2) a numeral should not stand after a noun and 3) alp and alp+agut are attested but a collective alp+aga is not and would not suit the context. On and t look quite different in runiform script but could look identical in Sogdian-Uygur writing, and mistaking one for the other could have caused the error. The sentence is interpreted and translated in section 4.631.

60 E.g. the editor of TT X on p.9 of her edition.
CHAPTER TWO

sources, and is the dialect aggregate closest to inscriptive Turkic; moreover, some runiform texts may not be earlier than the ‘Uygur’ corpus. In a few cases, using one script for transcribing a text written in some other script can be a tricky matter; here is an example: Whether a certain vowel is to be read as [o] or as [u] can be determined only through instances in the Indic scripts, Brāhmī and Tibetan, beside, of course, modern and comparative evidence. It was originally thought by Gabain and a few others that the Brāhmī sources represent a dialect by themselves. If a stem is written with o in a Brāhmī source, is not attested in Tibetan writing and if modern evidence is absent or conflicting, we cannot be sure how to read it in other sources, say ones written in Uygur writing.

The Uygur, Manichæan, Sogdian and Syriac scripts do not distinguish /i/ and /e/ from /ɪ/ or /ə/; /o/ from /ʊ/ or /œ/ from /ö/: The shortcomings of the Semitic system were only partly compensated for by (generally) using, in the first syllable, two alifs for /a/ to distinguish it from a single one for /ā/, and by creating the digraph WY for front rounded vowels. In some sources, /o/ appears to have been spelt with two Ws in certain monosyllabic stems, apparently to distinguish it from /u/. The non-distinctions of the Semitic system, which distinguishes between high and low vowels in the unrounded domain but not for rounded vowels, are found also in the runiform script as used in Mongolia. The asymmetry in distinguishing frontness only in the rounded domain, height only in the unrounded one appears in both of these otherwise quite different systems. Some inscriptions of the Yenisey area are more explicit than the Semitic Old Turkic alphabets in having special characters for /e/ or /ä/; most runiform texts write /ä/ with the character used for /a/. I read the runiform vowels as in Uygur. The Brāhmī and Tibetan writing systems show the greatest distinction in vowels, though the sources in Tibetan script which we have should be used very

---

61 In mss. in cursive writing double and single alef are not always distinguishable. Onset /a/ is in a part of the lexemes spelled with a single alef if two consonants follow, e.g. in alp (with alplan- but not alpagut, alpal- or alpïrkan-), amra- (with amran-, amrak, amrakstïz, amranëg, amraš, amrat-), amrïk, amrïl, amru, amit, arslan (but not arslantïg), artok (beside the variant with two alifs), artuč and artut. This does not happen if the second consonant belongs to a suffix, as in ač-mak, and hardly ever if the consonants become adjacent through syncopation, as with aḍr-īl- or aḍr-ok. alice, aldïrri, al-, alka- (with a single alef in a few early instances of the verb and of alkatmiš, alkinëu and alikš), alkoğ, alku and almïr are, however, spelled with two alifs.

62 In Arabic writing, e.g., a is distinguished from i but o is not distinguished from u; in general, alef serves as mater lectionis for low unrounded, ̣yâ’ for high unrounded vowels, but there is only one mater lectionis (wâw) for all rounded vowels.
cautiously: Their spelling is often strongly influenced by the fact that Tibetan itself was not spelled phonetically. Determining the pronunciation of what we find in those ms. has to take into account the expectations of a Tibetan reader alongside the phonetic values of the letters. We have no reason to believe that there was a special Brāhmaṇa dialect (as Gabain did at least at some stage and T.Tekin 2000 apparently still does), although the fluctuation in the pronunciation was clearly such that there were a number of possibilities (as in any language and as shown by variation within Brāhmaṇa and Tibetan evidence itself). Authorities on Uyghur now agree that Uyghur Brāhmaṇa was used for the same dialect as Uyghur script, which of course must have varied over time and space: Two Brāhmaṇa texts, TT VIII K⁶³ and O are found in Uyghur script as well, and scribes often introduced Brāhmaṇa glosses or aksaras into mss. in the latter. Wherever a word is attested in Tibetan or Brāhmaṇa script, that evidence is fully followed here as far as its pronunciation is concerned: Since, e.g., the word coming from Skt. abhiṣekā over Tokharian A and B abhiṣek is in TT VIII D17 spelled as abišik, this is what we adopt (as against abišek in the UW). The scribe did, after all, have the possibility of writing e in the last syllable.⁶⁴

[i] is spelled with yöd in all scripts of Semitic origin which were used for writing Old Turkic, except that we sometimes find it spelled with alef in a number of pre-classical texts (see section 1.2 above), e.g. in yalanlar (MaitH XX 1r19) which stands for yalînlar ‘flames’ or, in a Manichaean text, kap-ap ‘snatching’ (DreiPrinz 49). This apparently happens in Sogdian and Uyghur writing more often than in Manichaean writing; there is no collocational limitation for this spelling. Since alef in non-first syllables represents [a], a vowel unrounded and posterior like [i], whereas [i] is unlike [i] in being fronted, this could be a mainly graphic fluctuation, reflecting the intermediate nature of [i]. In no text is /ï/ generally spelled with alef, the most common spelling of [i] being yöd in all sources. Since, however, there are also some instances of alef for [i], e.g. käyl-ap and äšid-ap (quoted in the next paragraph), ig-sâz ‘healthy’ in ChristManMsFr ManFr r9, ârdâm-imâz ‘our virtue’ in Mait or the instrumental form siziks(i)zän ‘doubtlessly’ in TT VI 305, the phenomenon cannot be merely graphic but must also have a phonetic aspect.⁶⁵ Another matter with less phonetic relevance is the non-

---

⁶³ As yet unpublished; information from P. Zieme.
⁶⁴ See the remarks of A.v. Gabain on p.8 of her 1959 edition of TT X.
⁶⁵ elîgîn in TT VI 89 and twice 90 is, however, spelled with yöd, even though the vowel is here beside /gl/, which often lowers vowels. ‘s[ã]vânmîš’ in Yos 75 should, I think, be read as sięnâmiš.
writing of vowels in first syllables in such words as tädry, kārgāk, yarltka-, tērk, kānti, mān, sān, kālti ‘(s)he came’, bālgūr- ‘to appear’, kara ‘black’ and others. In original Semitic alphabets, only long vowels were explicit in any way, a feature inherited by some other languages (such as Sogdian) when using such alphabets. With time, complementary systems enabling the explicit expression of all vowels were devised for many languages using such alphabets, but in some of these the use of such complementary means remained optional. With a number of Semitic and Indic alphabets it became the rule to leave only low unrounded vowels (such as [a]) unexpressed. The spelling of the Turkic words mentioned was clearly kept from a time when there were such practices also with Turkic. In some groups of cases, however, the spelling of words without an explicit vowel may nevertheless be phonically relevant; e.g. beside /g/ (e.g. in the suffix +ILG more often spelled without than with vowels) or when vowels are absorbed by onset /y/ (e.g. in ymū and ygirmi).

In later Uygur mss., voiced and voiceless consonant letters (T and D, S and Z etc.) alternate quite freely, clearly without any phonetic or phonological background and without any regular causation. Uygur script does not distinguish between front /k/ and /g/ at all; the two dots, which are supposed to distinguish back /k/ from back /g/, are not used systematically in late Uygur mss. in any case. /Y/ is in all Semitic alphabets spelled as N + K – or, in Manichaean script, G – (and not X or, in Manichaean script, Γ) also in back-vowel words; otherwise we find some fluctuations in its spelling in early texts, e.g. siziæ as SYZYNNING in M III Nr. 10 r9 (Manichaean writing) or biziyæ as BYZYNKK in M III Nr. 9 V v6 (Uygur writing). The last mentioned form is actually related to a different phenomenon: the double spelling of consonants in coda position which occurs in Manichaean texts (and also commonly in mss. in Sogdian script). Thus we also have yük (M III Nr.3 r2), tününär (M III Nr.4 r1), s(ā)vāg (M III Nr.4 r5), māj(i)žiğ (M III Nr.4 r16), t(ā)lgāk (M III Nr.4 v15), fərkJıčlānmağ (M III Nr.4 v16), b(ā)lgülüğ (M III Nr.4 r9), tep (M III Nr.4 r4) as well as āšidāp and kālāp in ms.

66 Gabain 1941: 54 thinks that voiceless consonants may have become voiced between vowels, as happens in the Northern Turkic languages today. This is unlikely, since devoicing, the opposite process, is attested in this position just as commonly; a few examples for that are supplied by Prof. Gabain herself on the same page.

67 Late Uygur mss. were mostly written down under Mongol rule. In Classical Mongolian, which also uses the Uygur script, the two dots mark back /g/ and not back /k/.

68 The edition’s tipu, and blgülüğü in the previous word, are misreadings. Similar mistakes are found in Fedakâr.
The double spelling of letters to fill the end of a line can also be found in Buddhist mss. e.g. with additional W after bo ‘this’ and yügärü ‘facing’ or additional R after agîr ‘heavy’ in TT X 232, 285 and 299 respectively. Note that in these mss. the double spelling of letters to fill the end of a line comprises letters representing vowels and not only consonants.

When y is in the word onset followed by a front rounded vowel, mss. in Uygur script normally spell this vowel as if it belonged to the back series; e.g. in yörüg ‘interpretation’, yükün- ‘to bow to someone’, yüräk ‘heart’, yüz ‘face’ and ‘hundred’ or yûgûr- ‘to run’. There are a few other words with front rounded vowels in the first syllable which also spell this vowel as W and not as WY, such as kögûl ‘heart’ or (e.g. in TT X 440) kög ‘music’. The habit of spelling front rounded vowels as WY may have come up gradually, as vâd-less spellings for front vowels are much more widespread in pre-classical texts than in classical and late mss.. The front variant of the particle Ok, which is not a fully independent word, is also spelled without a Y, although it normally has a space before it.

Further spelling characteristics are discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3.

2.2. The vowels

The Proto-Turkic four-dimensional vowel symmetry, still existing e.g. in Yakut, consists of $2^4 = 16$ phonemes generated by four oppositions: back (a, i, o, u) vs. front (ä, i, ö, ū), low (a, o, ä, ö) vs. high (i, u, ü), unrounded (a, i, ä, i) vs. rounded (o, u, ö, ū) and long vs. short. In the original Turkic words of Old Turkic, 16 vowel phonemes may have been distinct only in the first syllable; very little is known of the other syllables in this respect. When, perhaps during the course of Old Turkic, the length opposition is given up altogether, there remain 9 vowels: 9 and not 8 because /ä:/ became /e/ and was retained as such. This /e/ appears, at some stage, to have been joined by [e] which was an allophone of /ä/ when followed by /i/. In non-first syllables, vowel harmony in principle left morphology with only four possibilities: with only four pertinent oppositions, between the archiphones /A/ (realised as /a, ä/), /U/ (= /u, ü/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /dney- less spellings for front vowels are much more widespread in pre-classical texts than in classical and late mss.. The front variant of the particle Ok, which is not a fully independent word, is also spelled without a Y, although it normally has a space before it.

Further spelling characteristics are discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3.

2.2. The vowels

The Proto-Turkic four-dimensional vowel symmetry, still existing e.g. in Yakut, consists of $2^4 = 16$ phonemes generated by four oppositions: back (a, i, o, u) vs. front (ä, i, ö, ū), low (a, o, ä, ö) vs. high (i, u, ü), unrounded (a, i, ä, i) vs. rounded (o, u, ö, ū) and long vs. short. In the original Turkic words of Old Turkic, 16 vowel phonemes may have been distinct only in the first syllable; very little is known of the other syllables in this respect. When, perhaps during the course of Old Turkic, the length opposition is given up altogether, there remain 9 vowels: 9 and not 8 because /ä:/ became /e/ and was retained as such. This /e/ appears, at some stage, to have been joined by [e] which was an allophone of /ä/ when followed by /i/. In non-first syllables, vowel harmony in principle left morphology with only four possibilities: with only four pertinent oppositions, between the archiphones /A/ (realised as /a, ä/), /U/ (= /u, ü/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /dney- less spellings for front vowels are much more widespread in pre-classical texts than in classical and late mss.. The front variant of the particle Ok, which is not a fully independent word, is also spelled without a Y, although it normally has a space before it.

Further spelling characteristics are discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3.

2.2. The vowels

The Proto-Turkic four-dimensional vowel symmetry, still existing e.g. in Yakut, consists of $2^4 = 16$ phonemes generated by four oppositions: back (a, i, o, u) vs. front (ä, i, ö, ū), low (a, o, ä, ö) vs. high (i, u, ü), unrounded (a, i, ä, i) vs. rounded (o, u, ö, ū) and long vs. short. In the original Turkic words of Old Turkic, 16 vowel phonemes may have been distinct only in the first syllable; very little is known of the other syllables in this respect. When, perhaps during the course of Old Turkic, the length opposition is given up altogether, there remain 9 vowels: 9 and not 8 because /ä:/ became /e/ and was retained as such. This /e/ appears, at some stage, to have been joined by [e] which was an allophone of /ä/ when followed by /i/. In non-first syllables, vowel harmony in principle left morphology with only four possibilities: with only four pertinent oppositions, between the archiphones /A/ (realised as /a, ä/), /U/ (= /u, ü/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /I/ (= /i, ï/) and /dney- less spellings for front vowels are much more widespread in pre-classical texts than in classical and late mss.. The front variant of the particle Ok, which is not a fully independent word, is also spelled without a Y, although it normally has a space before it.

Further spelling characteristics are discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3.
generalize /i/ in the last syllable, particularly when adjacent to palatal consonants) and /X/ (realised as /i, i, u, ü/, depending both on fronting and rounding). Further allophones of /X/ as well as ‘vowel attraction’ and vowel changes caused by adjacent consonants will be discussed in section 2.4. /U/ is realised as /o ö/ before /k/, except when the previous syllable has /u ü/, see section 2.51 for that.

2.21. Vowel length

The distinction between original 8 long and 8 short vowels can be very well reconstructed for first stem vowels; it is today retained to a very large extent in Yakut, Turkmen and Khaladj and has left traces and reflexes in a number of other Turkic languages. The most recent and extensive treatment of primary vowel length in first syllables (to where it may originally have been limited) in the modern and historical Turkic languages is T.Tekin 1995a, which also recounts the history of research of this aspect of Turkic vocalism. Unfortunately the author did not include in it a recapitulation of his 1967 paper, which shows that original Turkic long vowels function as long also for the purposes of the 'arâd metre of the QB, the 11th century Qarakhanid poem of more than 6000 verses, consistently with the theory that the Proto-Turkic long vowels were preserved in its language. The DLT also appears to make the right distinctions between vowels written only with diacritical vowel signs and those spelled with matres lectionis (alif, wâw and yâ‘, which are the signs of vowel length in the Arabic writing system), especially where a word serves as an entry for itself and is not quoted in a sentence intended to illustrate the use of some other lexeme; this evidence was last brought together in Tekin 1995: 97-113. All in all, vowel length as documented in Qarakhanid sources accords well with the evidence in the modern languages. In Kâşgari’s dialect, long vowels appear to have gotten shortened when stress went on to a suffix. Referring to stems in which the second letter is alif, wâw or yâ‘ he writes in fols. 515-516: “Rule. ... the medial ... letter may drop from the word rendering it biliteral in pronunciation, though not in writing; in its

---

71 This work is a good base for research in which most of the documentation is brought together. Its weakness concerning written documentation is that any sign that a word contains a long vowel is taken at face value and considered conclusive even if the word is, on other occasions, written short; moreover, Tekin trusts a source’s evidence also when it writes a vowel as long although no modern language testifies to this, sometimes when even he himself considers it to have been short in Proto-Turkic.
written form the letters remain sound.\footnote{As Kelly 1973: 156f., who quotes and comments the passage, remarks, this refers to Uygur writing, where vowel letters do not drop when the vowel is no longer long. This paper is an important contribution to the question of vowel length in Qarakhanid.} Example: The ‘forearm’ is called qöl. Then you say anîn golîn alî [here spelled without wûw] meaning ‘He grasped his arm’. It has become [short] like the word for ‘slave’, qul [in spelling and length], since the wûw has dropped out. Similarly yîl ‘wind’; in the course of speech you say anîn yeli küdûg ‘His wind is strong’ ... . It has become like the word for ‘year’, yîl [in spelling and length]. This is the rule for all nouns and verbs ...

In the runiform writing system, first syllable vowel length differences can be expressed only for /a/ and /ä/, since the presence of these sounds in first syllables is understood implicitly without recourse to the alâ character; other vowels have, in general, to be written out (although there are exceptions in some of the inscriptions). The explicit presence of this character can then in principle be used to mark /a:/ and /ä:/.

This is done rather consistently for /a:/ in some of the mss. in runiform script, namely the Irq Bitig, the ms. TM 342 and the lapidary text (‘Blatt’): They have a:gu ‘poison’, a:la ‘motley’, a:k ‘white’, a:rt ‘mountain pass’, a:ra ‘between’, a:s ‘food’, a:t ‘name’, a:z ‘few’, a:z ‘to stray’, a:zu ‘or’, ba:- ‘to bind’, sa:kin- ‘to think’, ta:š ‘stone’, ta:t:- ‘to taste’, ya:s ‘fresh grass’ and some derivates from these stems.\footnote{\label{r5}1 r5 of the edition of TM 342 (followed by Tekin 1995a: 91) writes the verb yarat-as if it had an explicit A in the first syllable, but the perfectly clear facs. shows this not to be the case. No Turkic language has yarat- with a long first-syllable vowel.}

These mss. only have very few questionable cases like ada+r-t- ‘to harm’ and aîûg ‘evil’ where we do not know whether the explicit A in the first syllable is a reflection of real vowel length for lack of modern documentation, and there are a few additional cases (like yâs and ara in the IrqB) where a word spelled as long also shows an instance without explicit A.\footnote{Other mss. are more problematic: TM 326, e.g., shows sa:v ‘speech’, whose vowel is known to be long from elsewhere, with A, but also spells sa:t- ‘to sell’, which probably had a short vowel, with A as well. The proverb collection reedited by Hamilton and Bazin in Turcica 4-5: 25ff. writes the as in tanuk and tamgu with A although they are short in the Turkic languages which retain length.} Where explicit A is, in these mss., used for marking the vowel /â/, its presence does not appear to indicate length, as the words in which it is used have long vowels in no other source. The practice described here must have been known already to the scribes of the Orkhon inscriptions: a:ç ‘hungry’, a:ç ‘to be hungry’, a:t ‘name, title’ and ta:m ‘wall’ (KT SE), the only words which are spelled with explicit A in the first syllable in the KT, BQ and KČ inscriptions, do indeed...
have Proto- and Common-Turkic lengths. Here, however, this practice was applied in an inconsistent and limited way: The word for ‘name’ was more often spelled without A than with it, and a:k ‘white’, a:ra ‘between’, a:z ‘few’, ba:- ‘to bind’ and sa:kin- ‘to think’, which appear with A in the quoted mss., do not have it in the Orkhon inscriptions. Nor are bar ‘there is’ and bay ‘rich’, which have long vowels in the modern languages, spelled with A in Orkhon Turkic. That the expression of vowel length is not part of the Orkhon Turkic writing system was already observed by Hovdhaugen, 1974: 61. Some additional evidence from the Yenisey inscriptions has been listed in Tekin 1995a: 90-91; it should, however, be checked on the base of newer or more responsible readings of these inscriptions. Doerfer 1981-82a: 111-2 has tried to explain the absence of A in some stems with long vowels by the hypothesis that the stem started with /h/, after which the long vowels are not supposed to appear; he thinks that /h/ is spelled with A only when the word starts with this vowel. This is not the case, as shown by the spelling of tâm.

In Uygur mss. in both the Manichaean and (much more numerously, naturally) the Uygur script we find that vowels are sometimes written doubly. Scholars have tried to interpret this in two ways. It was stated in the notes to U II 23,14 and 39,89 and then by Zieme 1969: 32 (and cf. Meyer 1965: 190 n.19) that these spellings may be an attempt to distinguish /o/ and /ö/ from /u/ and /ü/. The fact is that most instances represent rounded vowels: There are no aas,75 as two alifs are interpreted as [a] as opposed to [ä] and there never come more than two in a row; there is one single word spelled Ĩi76 and there are few words spelled with ii (to which we return below). Zieme quotes a number of instances of /o/ and /ö/ written doubly, giving place references.77 Others, on the other hand, have said that such repetitions are meant to be read as long vowels: This was the opinion of Gabain 1941 §16 (who also quotes some of the instances), Tuna 1960: 247-252, Pritsak 1963 (*)+,.-0/21	354 ak 1961: 34-36 and 1966: 153-154 and Tekin (1975) 1995a:

75 Tekin 1995a: 92 misunderstood the n. to M III 17, which says that āt ‘flesh, meat’ is sometimes spelled as at, and does not refer to at ‘name’.

76 Rather common, signifying ‘plant’ and possibly with a long vowel like all monosyllabic lexeme stems of the shape CV; the first vowel of its derivat ĭ-gaz is short, however.

91-94. Thus e.g. uu ‘sleep’ in Abhi (a rather late text) 511, 514 and 516 and uučₚₛᵤₚζ ‘endless’ seven times in Abhi, both words with vowel length. The double spelling of vowels is especially regular in some Chinese borrowings such as ‘dragon’ (spelled LWW), ‘army’ and ‘preface’ (both spelled SWW), ‘women’s quarters’ (spelled KWWN) etc.; this phenomenon should be separated from the double spellings of Turkic words: In these cases the spelling may also indicate diphthongs ((uuo, üö)), and in any case touches upon the pronunciation of the Chinese dialect which served the Uygurs as contact language. The word signifying ‘preface’ (in this book transcribed as swö) appears with +sI in HTs VII 18 but with the accusative suffix +üx in HTs VII 306, perhaps indicating that a pronunciation as sīw was an option. Leaving these instances aside, we find that there are numerous counter-examples for both hypotheses: uu ‘sleep’ (spelled as uv in U III 11,8, but gets the possessive suffix as +sI), uuč ‘tip, border, edge’, uuₚₑₚₜₚ ‘vile, insolent’ and yyuₚl ‘spring, fountain’ (e.g. in HTs, BT III and Suv) are, together with their derivates, some of the more common words spelled with WW which have high back rounded vowels. The word for ‘wind’ is often spelled as YYYL although its vowel is short in the modern languages; it might, perhaps, have been pronounced with a diphthong, yiel. The general impression, after looking at quite some texts, is that double spelling tends to occur more with /o/ than with other vowels, and more with long vowels than with short ones, but that it is not all too common in general, single spelling being more common for all words mentioned; some lexemes (with long or short vowels) tend to be more prone to this phenomenon than others.

The ability of some scripts of Indian origin to distinguish between long and short a, i and u is not put to any discernably systematic use;

---

78 Examples quoted in Tekin 1995a: 93. uut+ₚₛᵤₚζ ‘shameless’ (U II 86,40), also quoted there, is a different case: It is clearly a contraction of the well-attested uvut, which has the same meaning. Oguz uₚₜₚₚ – ‘to feel shy’ is mentioned already in the DLT; the fact that this verb still has a /t/ in Turkish shows that it is not in the same class as the other long vowels (which get followed by /d/).

79 yäm, which is used for am in U I 7 (Magier), may also stand for some such diphthong as âm.
least of all the BuddhKat with its Tibetan script. Tekin 1995a: 94-96 limited his research on this matter to TT VIII and lists only those cases where a vowel spelled as long correlates with a vowel he expects to be long; the opposite case is mentioned only with a few examples: He does admit, though, that it happens that long vowels are spelled as short and vice versa. See also Maue 1996: XXI for the Brāhmī practice in general. For i, the distinction is rare even in Sanskrit portions of the mss.; for a and u there appears to be free alternation between the signs for short and for long vowels. In the Uygur-Khotanese word list the character ？ expresses [o] and [ö] and there is no correlation with comparative length at all. Either the language no longer kept up the Proto-Turkic length distinction when the Indian scripts came into use for Uygur (in the 10th century?), or the Central Asian linguistic filters, through which the scripts went before reaching Turkic, had made the distinction into a purely orthographical (i.e. not phonetic) one or into one distinguishing certain qualities of the vowels but not their length. Transcribing insessional or Uygur texts as if their language consistently distinguished between long and short vowels (as done e.g. in the glossary of BT III) therefore seems misleading.

2.22. The vowel /e/

The nine vowel phonemes left after distinctive vowel length was given up were /a/, /ä/, /i/, /ö/, /u/ and /ü/ plus the phoneme /e/. As shown by Thomsen Hansen 1957, the last-mentioned came from Proto-Turkic long */ä:/ (especially in the first syllable). The opposition between /a/ and /ä/ seems to be still documented in early Old Turkic but that between the six other long vowels and their ‘normal’ counterparts appear to have disappeared already by our earliest texts.

The opposition */ä:/ > /e/ vs. /ä/ was, however, retained, apparently because it involved an opposition in vowel quality as well, disrupting the three-dimensional close-knit structure of the original vowel system. Saving this cube structure appears to have been Bazin’s only motive for not recognising /e/ as an Old Turkic phoneme, a view approvingly quoted by Zieme 1969: 33. Zieme 1969 expressed disbelief in the phoneme /e/ as distinct from /ä/, though he did admit the reality of the sound /e/ and mentions phonemic oppositions such as ǎlīg ‘hand; fifty’ vs. ēlīg ‘king’; cf. also et- ‘to arrange’ vs. āt- ‘to emit a sound’. /e/ did, in fact, stay distinct from both /i/ and /ü/; its early existence in first

80 Zieme has, of course, changed his view quite some time ago, but Johanson 2001: 1723a still thinks that it is “kontrovers ... ob dem ā ein höheres e gegenüberstand”.

syllables can be reconstructed from modern Turkic languages (e.g. Azeri or Anatolian dialects). The Middle Turkic Nahju 1-Farādīs distinguishes between [ä], [e] and [i] by spelling the first with fatḥa (sometimes together with alif), the second with fatḥa and yāʾ (cf. Clauson 1962: 163) and the third with kasra (sometimes together with yāʾ). The spelling of coda /e/ as fatḥa plus yāʾ appears already in the DLT, e.g. in the word süvıre ‘pointed’. Concerning Old Turkic proper, the evidence is as follows: It is always spelled with Y in Uygur ms. sources written in Uygur, Manichæan and also runiform script, with Ā or I in mss. in Tibetan script, with Ā in the hippological word list in Khoṭanese brāhmi, but it is spelled with explicit E in the bulk of Brāhmī manuscripts.81 All instances of /e/ in non-first syllables are linked to a preceding /e/ and therefore clearly conditioned by it. /ā/ and /i/ are never spelled with Brāhmī E. Exceptions (e.g. once kīcā where one would expect kečā for ‘evening’, once ti- ‘to say’ etc.) are quite rare and can be considered mere errors; they may be reflexes of the spelling of Uygur script. Thrice eliγ for āliγ ‘hand’ may rather have come about through regressive assimilation; the same may be true for thrice el(i)t-, which exists beside ālt-, and for the numerous instances where ‘to hear’ is spelled with onset e beside two Brāhmī instances where this verb is still spelled as āšid- (cf. section 2.401). In most runiform inscriptions we find a fluctuation between ili and implicit notation (otherwise to be understood as a or ā in the first syllables of words in the Orkhon inscriptions), whereas no such fluctuation is ever found either with /ā/ or with /i/s.82 The practice of scholars in Turkey and of the early Berlin

81 5 times bečin / bečen ‘monkey’, bel ‘waist’, 6 times ber- ‘to give’ (with derivates), 18 times beš ‘five’, eg’il ‘lay person’, 5 times el ‘tribe’, 5 times elig or eleg ‘king’, thrice el(i)t- ‘to carry off, lead away etc.’ vs. once ālt-, ānc and twice encigo ‘peace’, āšē ‘pot’, 13 times āšet- āšet- āšat- ‘to hear’ (with derivate) vs. twice āšid-, 4 times āš- ‘to prepare’ (including derivates), 9 times eyin or even ‘following’, 4 times ken(ki) ‘later, after, finally’, 5 times ken ‘wide’, 7 times kert ‘kert ‘true, truth’ and derivates, 8 times ket- ‘to depart’ and derivate, leşp ‘phlegm’, men ‘flour’, seşin- ‘to sense’ and 6 times sezik / sezek ‘doubt’, about 60 times te- ‘to say’ and te- ‘to be considered to be’ (vs. once ti-), tēr ‘pollar’, 6 times tēse / tetsi (thus once, possibly to be read as tetsi) ‘student’, twice tēlē- vs. twice tilē ‘to wish’, twice ye- ‘to eat’, 29 times yeg ‘better’, twice yel ‘wind’, yeṃiš ‘fruit’, yenā ‘again’, 8 times yer ‘ground’, twice yerinča ‘world’, Yeti ‘seven’, yet- ‘to reach’ and yez ‘artemisia (a plant)’.

82 ilgärı in KT E21, spelled by the editors without onset I, appears to be the only exception; according to Doerfer 1994: 108 it is spelled with a ligature consisting of I and I and not in defective manner. For āl(i)t- āl(i)t-, the spelling with onset I in BQ E19 (as against seven instances of defective spelling in Tuñ and KT) appears to show that the variant el(i)t- was old. Doerfer (p. 109) finds that there is a great difference between the Ongin, KČ and Tuñ inscriptions, which he considers to be older, and the KT and BQ inscriptions, which he takes to be later, in that defective spelling
school (the tradition going from Müller and Le Coq through Bang, Gabain and Zieme, corrected in recent years) of spelling /e/ as /i/ is unjustified: The distinction between a and u, e.g., is based on just such evidence as that between e and i (and stands, in a few cases, on just as shaky legs). We may not always be completely sure, but the informed guess founded on as much information as possible must be made. Some South Siberian runiform inscriptions even have a special character for e (whereas other inscriptions from that area have instead a letter for ä which distinguishes that phoneme from both a and i). The fluctuation referred to turns up also with a few instances of Proto-Turkic *ä appearing adjacent to /y/: The (apparently rather early) change yä > ye created additional /e/s which were not (originally) long, perhaps e.g. in yet- ‘to suffice’.\(^{83}\) This is a simple case of assimilation (still taking place in Azeri, which still has the nine vowel system). Orkhon Turkic fluctuation should not be confused with one or two cases where there appears to be a dialect variation between /ä/ and /i/: There is, in Old Turkic, both äki and iki ‘two’, but this word probably had no /e/: Orkhon Turkic consistently has /ä/ but sources in Brāhmi and Tibetan writing have numerous examples with i (not e). Manichæan texts fluctuate (there is, e.g., äkigün ‘as a pair’ and äkinti ‘second’ in M III 14,61 and 15,171 respectively) while non-Manichæan sources in Uygur script consistently have ‘Y’. Much evidence concerning the spelling of Old Turkic (and not only inscriptional, in spite of its title) /e/ has been brought together by Doerfer 1994.

2.23. The vowel /i/?

Some scholars, e.g. Pritsak 1961: 32 and 1963: 52, denied that there is an opposition /i/ : /ä/ in Old Turkic; cf. also Johanson 1993: 87 and Röhrborn 1996: 181f.\(^{84}\) In original Turkic words the opposition can of

---

\(^{83}\) After original long vowels, voiceless consonants become voiced in Turkish when they appear between vowels; this does not, however, happen in the aorist form yet-er (unlike yedek < yet- ‘to lead on’, which was originally applied to a horse one led with oneself to mount when the horse one was riding got tired). The sequence /yä/ no longer exists in Brāhmi sources.

\(^{84}\) Röhrborn bases his opinion on evidence from the rules of rote rhyme (which serves as base for Old Turkic verse and makes stanzas accord in their beginning and not in their end), stating that i\(^{o}\) and i\(^{ö}\) are made to rhyme. However, i\(^{ö}\) not only rhymes with i\(^{o}\) but also with e\(^{a}\); e\(^{a}\) rhymes with a\(^{u}\) and ò\(^{ö}\) with a\(^{u}\) and even na\(^{ö}\) (in nayrag ‘Buddha’s characteristic mark’) with a\(^{ö}\). Old Turkic clearly followed eye rhyme (as opposed to ear
course only be found in first syllables, as synharmonism regulates their alternation in non-first syllables, cancelling their opposition in them; this is so for all other vowels as well. The language does appear to have this phonemic opposition in first syllables, in view of such pairs as verbal tik- ‘to stuff’ vs. tik- ‘to erect’ and sik- ‘to squeeze’ vs. sik- ‘to copulate (male subject)’, or nominal kır ‘mountain’ (and ki:r ‘grey’) vs. kir ‘filth’, ĭrk ‘omen’ vs. ĭrk ‘ram’ and ki:n ‘sheath, scabbard’ vs. ki:n ‘navel; musk’; these are shown to differ by the fact that their velars are spelled differently in most of the writing systems. The pairs kiš ‘winter’ vs. ki:š ‘sable’, stık ‘shallow’ vs. sik ‘penis’ kiz ‘box etc.’ vs. ki:z ‘girl’ and ‘costly’ and kır- ‘to scrape off’ vs. ki:r- ‘to enter’ are at least near-minimal, as their vowels are of different length, in so far as the length opposition was kept up in dialects of Old Turkic: Evidence for this is, however, rather weak; my spelling of ‘to enter’ as ki:r- in the previous sentence may therefore be anachronistic. The opposition ĭrkla- ‘to consult the omens’ vs. ĭrklä- ‘to tread on something’ may have been perfect only for some varieties of Old Turkic, as the latter verb appears to have had an onset */h/.

Strangely enough, finding such pairs in words involving /g/ seems to be more difficult: There is tïgra- ‘to be tough’ (rare, but cf. tïgrak ‘tough’) vs. tigrä- ‘to emit certain sounds’, and cf. yigtür-., a hapax in the DLT which might signify ‘to squeeze’, vs. yıgtur- ‘to cause to heap’. As against iglä- ‘to be or become ill’ we have iğla- ‘to weep’, but the more common variant of the latter is yıgla-, pointing towards */hīgla-. Oppositions not involving velars, which receive suffixes in their back-vowel and front-vowel alternants respectively, are even harder to come by. One example is tîn ‘breath, spirit’ vs. tin ‘halter’; both words are spelled with and without yö in the DLT. If one does not insist on staying within one part of speech one could mention sïz, the imperative of the verb signifying ‘to ooze’ vs. siz ‘you (pl.)’. Otherwise one seems to find only imperfect pairs such as

---

85 DLT and base of the common verb kizlä-.
86 The y in yilkä- in UigPañc 66 and 88 (with normal metathesis and loss of /r/ before /k/) must be a reflex of that. Nor would ĭrkla-., which is an ad-hoc derivate from ĭrk ‘omen’, be prone to such phonetic processes.
87 There is no reason for this verb to have had a long vowel as it does not have one in modern languages; the EDPT ascription of vowel length is apparently based on the spelling in some of the DLT instances, which are influenced by Arabic word patterns.
Chapter Two

*ti̯ː* - ‘to tear to shreds’ (and *tit* ‘larch tree’\(^{88}\)) vs. *tit* - ‘to renounce’, and *il* - ‘to descend’ vs. *iːl* - ‘to catch, cling, attach’; the last mentioned verb in fact originally started with an /h/, as the numerous examples with #y°\(^{89}\) show. Johanson 1991: 85 gives the DLT opposition *il* - : *iːl* - as an example for the reality of the front / back distinction in Qarakhanid. Kāšgarī (fol.94) does, indeed write that the infinitive of the former is spelled with kāf, that of the latter with qāf, and that the former’s aorist is *ilār*, the latter’s *iːlur*. The aorist distinction between the two verbs is borne out also by the QB; not, however, the backness distinction; there, both verbs are front: From the verb signifying ‘to descend’ we find *ilgü* in QB 1086 (ms. AB; C replaces it with the better-known *en*-*) and *ilmäk* in 1762 (only C; A *yîlmaq*, B *enmäk*); the meanings are clear in both cases. Although, therefore, the grammarian Kāšgarī living in Bağdād was aware of the backness of the verb signifying ‘to descend’, that no longer corresponded to Qarakhanid usage of his time, at least as far as Yūsuf is concerned. The opposition *iː* : *iː* thus seems to be rather linked to the presence of /k/ and /g/; we know that the front and back realisations of /k/, transcribed as *q* and *k* respectively, are audibly different in all Turkic languages, and should have been so in Old Turkic as well. Note the runiform character *q ~ q*\(^{90}\), which is used for representing voiceless velars specifically when they appear beside /i/. We might therefore consider following Dankoff & Kelly 1982: 61-62, who dispense with /iː/ as a phoneme altogether, assuming a phonemic distinction /k/ : /q/ (as e.g. in Arabic) instead, and complement it with an opposition /g/ : /j/\(^{90}\). How do we know, in fact, that the opposition is not merely an underlying one, as e.g. in Classical Mongolian, where there was no [i] but only [i]? Because the Mongolian writing system (coming from the Uyghur script) always uses K and not X with /iː/, the opposition manifesting itself only in the synharmony of subsequent syllables,\(^{90}\) whereas Old Turkic does distinguish between front and back consonants also in the same syllable as these vowels. In the runiform script this is the case not only with /k g/\(^{90}\), as in the Semitic writing

---

\(^{88}\) The DLT spelling of this with *yā* as second letter could be due to Arabic triradical word patterning.

\(^{89}\) I use the degree sign as a sign of abbreviation, as done in transcriptions of Sanskrit; this means that there are further sounds to follow, that – in this case – this is /y/ at the beginning of a word.

\(^{90}\) I mean the fact that the genitive of the 3rd person demonstrative, e.g., is *inu* and not * enim*. Even assuming genetic relationship between Turkic and Mongolic, however, the situation in Mongolian cannot be used as an argument for believing in a neutral /iː/ in Proto-Turkic, as some other details make it likely that the opposition *iː* : *iː* was a real one in Pre-classical Mongolian.
systems, but also with /b t d y l n r s/, in some Yenisey inscriptions also with /ŋ/; thus ‘idok ‘sacred’ is spelled with ı́ in the Orkhon inscriptions, ‘idü ‘he sent’ as ı́ ‘due to assimilation of the alveolars) and so forth. Dankoff & Kelly’s view therefore cannot apply to Old Turkic as a whole; nor would one gain anything by adopting it for Qaraqhanid, because [k] and [q] would still have to function as allophones in all syllables having vowels other than the high unrounded ones. Still, as there was little functional load on the opposition /ı́ : ı́ except in the contiguity of /k/ and /g/, this opposition was bound to weaken, were it not for synharmonism and for the symmetries of the harmony system.

A breakdown in the syllable of the vowel itself, not making the whole word follow suit, can be observed best when the scribe used runiform writing, in which the front and back alternants are distinguished for most of the consonants. In Orkhon Turkic the commonest consonants with this phenomenon (listed in Tekin 1968: 71-72) are /s/ and /y/, e.g. in ı̇ly’U = sı̇-yu ‘breaking’ or ı̇mšak = yımšak ‘soft’. Cf. even sigü ‘sob’ spelled with s̱ but g̱. Such instances do not have to be of phonetic significance, however, as s̱ and y̱ are sometimes used in the Orkhon inscriptions also in conjunction with the back vowels /a/, /u/ and /o/ (though s̱ and y̱ are admittedly a bit more common with /ı́/); see Tekin 1968: 39-40. Examples with /t/ are ṯı̇ Employment = tı̇glı ‘listen!’; ṯı̇ḏA = tı̇ḏ- a ‘holding back’ (KT N11) and ṯı̇ḻ ı̇g̱ = tı̇ḻ-ı̇g̱ ‘the news (acc.)’ (Tuñ 32). Nor is it easy to classify the fronting in tı̇ḏ̱mIš̱ ı̇ḏ-mIš̱ < ı̇ḏ- ‘to send’ in O F2, as the -mIš suffix is always spelled with front s.

It is rare for a front consonant to appear not before but after *ı̇; I would therefore take the verb to really have been pronounced as id- in this case (before -mIš!). Note, in this connection, the ṉ appearing in the codas on the 3rd person possessive, the volitive and the negative converb suffixes +(s)l(n+), -(A)yIn and -mAtI(n), also when added to bases with back synharmonism. The high vowels of these three suffixes and of -mIš may, in the Orkhon inscriptions, always have been pronounced as [i] and not as [ı]: The consonant of the instrumental suffix +(X)n is never spelled as ṉ even when its expected vowel was ı́. Such fronting found in Orkhon Turkic becomes marginal in the inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire and completely disappears in the runiform mss., which are in the Uygur dialect. We have no way of knowing how these suffixes were pronounced by the authors of Uygur mss. in other scripts, but cases like the consistent Uygur spelling of the suffix sequence -mIš+kA with the letter X come to show that the fronting of ı́ in suffixes was subphonemic if it existed at all. The language of the
Second Türk Empire thus shows synharmonism irregularities related to the presence of /ui/ while no such phenomenon is discernible in Imperial or Xinjiang Uygur, also where written in runiform script.

The contiguity of the palatal consonants ē, y, ŋ and ś was no doubt one of the early factors causing the first-syllable passage ŋ > i to affect the whole word: e.g. in İrqB 53, where biš- ‘to ripen’ is used in the form biš-di, spelled with b2 and d2; similarly the converb form bič-ă ‘cutting’ appears to have been used in İrqB 37, whereas Uygur normally has the verb in the form bič-.

Secondly, iyy- ‘to suppress’, whose fronted forms and derivates are partly documented in the OTWF (see index). Another word with a palatal consonant which got fronted at an early stage is iš- ‘work’: Its numerous examples in the DLT have back vowels with a single exception, we find islarığ in Pothi 80 (Manichaean) and the instance spelled ‘YSÑKZN in M I 10.13 is likely to have had back vowels.91 However, two examples in the (equally Manichaean) Xw have suffixes with front k, that is the rule also in Uygur texts and išlah- and its derivates have front vowels in the DLT.

The existence of inča beside inča should also be ascribed to fronting with the concomitant influence of /i/ (though other explanations are also possible for the existence of this variant; see section 3.132), yiltizlig in BT XIII 12.53 shows that yiltiz ‘root’ had a fronted variant.

birgarudun sığar ‘in the direction towards the south’ in M III nr.4, 10.141 (ms. U 47 in Uygur writing; double-dotted X) shows that the numerous forms of birdin, birgärü and biryä in Orkhon Turkic and other Manichaean sources must all be secondary.92 ī ‘vegetation’ normally has back vowel suffixes but appears with a fronted dative suffix in Ht V 4 a24. til ‘tongue’, finally, has no palatal consonants and is well attested with back harmony (also still in the DLT’s derivates til+ak and til+ik-) but appears as til with suffixes showing front k e.g. in U II 7,10, U III 72,28, KP 12,2 and the DLT.

---

91 /ui/ is more often spelled with alef in preclassical texts than /i/. Scholars have confused iš ‘work’ with eš ‘debt’, the two lexemes surviving in Yakut as išs and iâš respectively. What the runiform inscriptions have in a binome with küč is eš ‘debt’ and not eš ‘work’, which explains the front vocalism; cf. OTWF 456 (with n.55) for additional details.

92 Clauson (EDPT 361) assumes that the instance is an error; this would have been likely if the ms. had been in Manichaean writing, where G and r have rather similar shapes. As it is, we cannot simply ’emend’ it away.

93 I take the original shape to have been *hi, in view of the fluctuations in the shape of (y)ı́gäč ‘tree’, which probably was a derivate from this. There is no reason to assume vowel length, as done by Clauson and Tekin, in spite of the spelling with two yäk in Uygur.
When we find the word for ‘thousand’ spelled with \( b^2 \) in BQ S1 and Tuñ 14 (as against \( b^1 \) in Tuñ 16 and 18), we cannot know whether any suffix added to it would have had front or back vowels. I would assume that the pronunciations \( bï\) and \( bi\) existed side by side, or that the actual pronunciation was in between, i.e. that the opposition was neutralised. The older pronunciation is supported by \( bi\ï\), a term denoting a military unit among the Uygurs of the Steppe Empire (attested at least thrice in ŠU) and by the second vowel of \( minggan\), the Mongolian word for ‘a thousand’; the latter by \( miñlig\) in TT II,2 57 (an early Manichaean text). The situation of a conservative and a progressive variant existing side by side is made use of in the QB for poetic purposes, when we find both \( tîl\) and \( til\) used to suit the rhyme. When there are fluctuations, I take all \( ðî/s\) to have been primary and the \( ðî/l\) variants to have been secondary: I take this direction to be the more natural one in the absence of any additional factors (as e.g. glottalization would have been). I therefore take Turkmen \( ðî:z\) ‘trace, track’ to show the original shape of what sometimes appears as \( ãz\) in Old Turkic.  

Most Turkic languages today do have an ã, both phonologically, i.e. for the intents and purposes of synharmonism, and phonetically. A few have, through centuries of intensive language contact, fronted the ã phonetically but have left its phonemic value unchanged, e.g. Urban Uzbek or Standard New Uygur under Persian / Tajik influence. Looking at the Turkic world as a whole one finds that ã has, all in all, shown itself to be very resilient. What contact influence could the speakers of Old Turkic have undergone? The early Turks were, till the 9\(^{th}\) century, bilingual mainly in Chinese and Sogdian. From Chinese they borrowed words with ãl, e.g. \( mïr\) ‘honey’, \( çîn\) ‘true’, \( šïk\) ‘a measure of capacity’, \( sïr\) ‘lacquer’ or \( çïg\) ‘a foot (as a measure of length)’. Sogdian short \( ðal\) has been taken to have had central vowels as allophones. When we find that the Sogdian word for ‘sandalwood’, transliterated as \( çntn\) and ultimately coming from Sanskrit \( candana\), is borrowed into Old Turkic as \( çïntan\), we take it that the Uygurs got their ãl from Sogdian.  

---

94 I disagree with T.Tekin 1995: 183 on this lexeme; the QB has it with both front and back forms of the accusative.

95 Uygur does not itself raise vowels. We know that the Uygur vowel was ãl and not ãl because it is attested in the runiform Irq Bitig spelled with n’, the back N. I don’t think Sogdian had i in the first syllable of this word, as that would have been spelled with mater lectionis, i.e. Y.
language which the Turks mostly got into contact with when, most
numerously from the 9th century on, they streamed into the North
Eastern part of the Tarim basin, was Tokharian. The Tokharian schwa,
transliterated as ā, can, in certain circumstances, perhaps be stated to
have been less front than /i/ and higher than /a/; the Uygurs might
perhaps have assimilated it to their [ĩ]. It does not, in short, seem likely
that the languages which Uygurs can be presumed to have been
bilingual in would induce them to abandon their /ĩ/.

The contact situation could have been different in West Turkestan,
where Qarakhanid developed, especially when New Persian started to
be the lingua franca in the 10th century. In the DLT the opposition /ĩ : i/
in so far as it affects suffix harmony is retained approximately to the
same degree as in Uygur: Dankoff & Kelly 1982: 61 give a longer list
where original harmony exists and where stems consistently show back
or front vowel suffixes respectively, and a shorter list of stems with
fluctuations. Some of the fluctuations have already been mentioned, as
they reflect a situation found already in Uygur; others are due to errors
on the part of the editors96 or to the second hand which changed around
a lot in the ms.97

Most of the writing systems used for writing Old Turkic do not have a
special character for [ĩ] and generally use for it the same character as
for [i]. There is, however, one alphabet, not much used for writing this
language, with which a distinction does appear to be made: As stated
already by Gabain 1974: 391 (note 14), texts written in Tibetan script
do seem to make the difference, though the means are highly irregular.
This statement is largely corroborated by Maue & Röhrborn 1984: 292-4
for the Catechism, the relatively early and most important such text.

Another important feature speaking for the reality of /ĩ/ is the
alternation alef ~ yōd in non-first syllables, much more common in
back than in front synharmony, whether it be the mere graphemic
alternation described in section 2.1 or the phonetic lowering caused by
/g r l/, documented in section 2.402. These two phenomena, which gave
the same result but have a different distribution both in terms of sources

96 bıčak ‘knife’, e.g., attested in Uygur and the DLT, does not come from bıč- but is a
diminutive from bi: ‘knife’; the base of tıšä- and its derivates is not identical with tıš ‘tooth’.
97 The Middle Turkic ‘corrector’s’ work is well discernible by its different ink. It
changed tıčlä-mak to tıčl amaq, e.g., whereas tıč ‘knee’ never had a back vowel. yıd+i-
mak ‘to be putrid, to stink’ is also by the second hand, while the first hand still wrote
yıdımaq, reflecting original pronunciation. For yıl-ı- it was apparently the first hand
which wrote down both possibilities, both lāf and qāf, but then this stem has two palatal
consonants.
and of phonetics, can be explained only if [i] was a phonetic reality in non-first syllables beside /l/ being a phonological one. /l/ may often have been fronted in first syllables except where a velar was around, both as a synchronic alternant and as a diachronic process; this did not, however, generally have any effect on subsequent syllables, which stayed back-vocalic. The presence of /l/ outside first syllables appears to have been quite solid, except in a few suffixes such as -mIš.

2.24. The archphoneme /X/

The widespread view that the vowels serving as realizations of /X/ were ‘reduced’ (the graphemes i and u representing ‘/â/, the graphemes ī and ū ‘/ɐ̂/’) is unfounded; in section 1.33 above I quote some authors’ thoughts on this matter. Most recently, Johanson 2001: 1725b has expressed the view that the element “‘” (as he calls it iconically) “in phonetischer Hinsicht vermutlich ein schwa oder reduzierte Vokale (ä, è s.w.) darstellte”. Vowels of the archphoneme /X/ are usually not written explicitly in runiform texts; nor, however, are vowels of suffixes containing other archphonemes if their realisations show the same phonemes: e.g. /u/ in the suffix -gUr- (not ‘-gXr-’) of tur-gur-u (Irk Bitig), where the previous syllable contains an /ul/. Vowels of all archphonemes can get syncopated in non-first non-last syllables (by no means only /X/, as still maintained in Johanson 2001: 1723a), syllable structure and consonant tactics permitting, e.g. /l/ in the stems of the common ögr-ünč, ögr-ünču and ögr-inču < ögir- or kärgük < *käri-gük, /l/ in ärgür- < *ärü-gUr-, čomrurlar (DKPAMPb 70) < čom-_ur- or šišrun- < *šiš-šUr-šn-, /Al in ötš-ùm < ötš-l- as discussed in OTWF 293, tirgök < tirä- or targa from tara-98 ört-, a variant of ör-it-, and yort-, a variant of yorš-t-, also result from the syncopation of /l/. Syncopation is well documented within stems (as described in section 2.403), before and in derivational affixes and even perhaps within inflectional suffixes. Onset vowels of enclitics (of any archphoneme) are elided after vowels (e.g. inčak < inčä ą́k ‘just this way’ in the runiform ms. TM 342, 2 v2); so are suffix vowels in the coda if the next word starts with a vowel (at least in verse, as poetic licence).

There appear to be no suffixes ending in /X/. This is, again, no proof that /X/ was shorter than the other vowels. Nor is the fact that Mongolic cognates of Turkic words often have a different additional vowel a sufficient reason for assuming that that vowel can be attributed to

---

98 Low vowels are, however, less readily syncopated than high vowels, as shown by lexemes such as yarašš, tüŋšš and yöläšš.
Turkic. är ‘man’, e.g., does not necessarily come from *ärä only because that form existed in Mongolic (to use the example given by Johanson 2001: 1723a): Mongolic ärä may, e.g., have been copied from the plural form ärän, the /ı/ getting metanalysed through analogy with Mongolic *ń stems. Mongolian saya- ‘to milk’ does not go back to Proto-Turkic *sagä- either, as assumed by Rőna-Tas 1998: 72: Mongolian ‘X’ is a spelling convention for [ä]; that it has no phonetic or diachronic significance whatsoever is seen, among other indications, in loan words such as Šayan [Šám] ‘Syria’. As a circular corollary to their assumption of general coda syncopation, Johanson and Rőna-Tas think that ‘retained’ coda vowels (such as in kara ‘black’) must have been long; there is no evidence for this claim.

Vowels (again not only /X/) appear to have gotten reduced by adjacency to certain consonants. Spellings like t(ä)lgäk (M III Nr.4 v15), b(ä)lgülüg (M III Nr.4 r9) or k(ä)l- (DreiPrinz 25, 26, 28 and 29) in early texts should probably be understood to show that /ı/ could ‘swallow up’ the vowel, getting syllabic itself. The /ı/ no doubt helped in the reductions of näglük from nä+(A)gU+lxk in TT X 265, aglik ‘treasure house, storehouse’ from agi+lk in KP 7,5 and 8 and olra- < orl+la-. Some other such phenomena are discussed in section 2.403.

The question of the quality of the vowels participating in the archphoneme /X/ is a vexed one. In the vast majority of instances in non-Indic alphabets they are spelled with Y, W or WY (or the runiform character signalling a front rounded vowel) and not with ‘. In section 2.402 we show that /ı/ is lowered when adjacent to /r l/ and especially /g/, so that it does come to be spelled with characters indicating a low back unrounded vowel, and this in all stages of Old Turkic and in texts of all spelling and cultural traditions. This is a clear conditioned lowering of one vowel, which may be participating in /X/, in /ı/ or may not be assignable to any of the two. In section 2.1 I pointed out that it was natural for /ı/ to sometimes be spelled like /a/ even when not lowered: Y traditionally denotes /ı/, and /ı/ is unrounded and back-vowelled like /a/ though it also is unrounded and high like /ı/. This only happens in early texts, mostly but not necessarily Manichaean. These

99 Anatolian Turkic äränlär may show that ärän was, when left as the only plural form ending in +Ar, taken to be a singular. A related process is connected with Turkic süt ‘milk’, which, by back-formation, became sün in Mongolic – because süt was felt to contain the Mongolic plural suffix.


101 I take the rather common nälük to be a further contraction from this form.
two points are not sufficient for explaining all the facts, however, as there also are Manichaean instances where /i/ is also spelled with alef. Adjacency to /g r l/ does not predominate here, so that combinatorial lowering cannot be the explanation: Doerfer 1993: 121-125 lists els (+i)mäz (M I 8,11, TeilBuch), ämgäk+(ä)mäzin (M I 11,19, TeilBuch), käl-tämäz and (M I 10,12, TeilBuch) iślä-dämäz (M I 11,14, TeilBuch) with +(...mXz, bögädmüs+äng(i)n (DreiPrinz 66), ärmäk+ängäl[är (M III nr.27 r14) and ł+ängäl(i)n (M I 11,19, TeilBuch) with +(Xn)Xz, elig+äg (DreiPrinz 94) and tämir+äg (M I 8,12, TeilBuch) with +(Xn)g, yüz+ängülän (M I 10,9, TeilBuch) with the accusative ending after possessive suffixes, kiši+näj (M I 8,14 and 15, TeilBuch), bög+näj and yäklär+näj (U IVA 152 and 168) with +(n)Xn, tämir+än (M I 8,11, TeilBuch), ärklig+än (TT VI 90 ms. L, beside three instances of +än in the sentence) and +t(ä)v+än (M III nr.4 r11) with +(...n). Interestingly, the lowering of /i/, common in one or two Manichaean texts but rare otherwise, seems to take place only when the /i/ is part of the archphoneme /X/. It would appear, then, that at least the unrounded members of /X/ may, in some archaic variants of Old Turkic (with a few remnants in texts of the standard stage) not have been phonetically identical to the members of /I/ and /U/ but lower. The graphematic hypothesis for the spelling of /i/ may also be unnecessary. This by no means signifies, however, that any /X/ vowels were shorter than vowels of other archphonemes.

2.3. The consonants

The consonant system for early Old Turkic, not including sounds found only in loan words, is the following:

---

102 The genitive forms he writes as +äg have not be taken over here as they can, if written in Uygur script, also be read as +n(i)g.
103 What precedes this should have been read as kîç agar ‘precious and honoured’ and not as read by the editor.
The difference between the first and the second column of consonants must have been one both of voice and of tension, i.e. strong (more energetic, *fortis*) vs. weak (less energetic, *lenis*) pronunciation; the two distinctions must have been joined to varying degrees. The term ‘stop’ applies to /p t k/ but not to /ç/, which is an affricate. It does not apply to the voiced orals, whose main variants are fricative: We could have written /d/ as /ð/ but found it more convenient here — following the practice of most work on Old Turkic — not to use Greek letters either in transcription or in transliteration. /d/ was realised as a stop [d] only when it was preceded by one of the voiced continuants /r l n/ or (in some cases) /l/. There is a [b] at the word onset; within words, [b] appears only in late texts: Onset [b] could be equally assigned to /v/ as to /p/. We use the letters  *b*  (in onset position) and  *v*  (elsewhere),  *d*  and  *g*  to transcribe the voiced oral consonants in all positions. Among the velars, fricativity was not characteristic of the voiced member of the opposition but rather of the voiced and partly also the unvoiced allophones obtaining in back-harmonic syllables.

The nasality opposition is fullest for the alveolar domain. It is weakest among the palatals, since the opposition /y : ñ/ is cancelled for the great majority of sources not written in runiform script. The opposition between oral labials and /m/ is cancelled for most of Old Turkic when an onset [b] is (after a vowel) followed by a nasal, as [b] is then replaced by /m/. In marginal sources we also sometimes witness a /v ~ m/ alternation between vowels, as in the DLT’s  *küürkän* /  *kümürkän* ‘wild onion’. A /g ~ َη/ alternation is found in verbs such as َāğ- ~ َāğ- ‘to bend’; suffixes containing َη/, e.g. the 2nd person possessive suffixes, are often (especially in inscriptive Turkic) found with /g/ instead of the nasal.

/ʃ/ and /z/, the unvoiced and the voiced alveolar sibilants, are put into one column for convenience. The placing of /r/ among the velars is arbitrary; we do not know how this phoneme was pronounced.

### Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unvoiced orals</th>
<th>voiced orals</th>
<th>nasals</th>
<th>sibilants</th>
<th>liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>labials</td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>v</em></td>
<td><em>m</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alveolars</td>
<td><em>t</em></td>
<td><em>d</em></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td><em>s</em></td>
<td><em>z</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatals</td>
<td><em>č</em></td>
<td><em>y</em></td>
<td><em>ā</em></td>
<td><em>š</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velars</td>
<td><em>k</em></td>
<td><em>g</em></td>
<td><em>ğ</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>r</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.31. The labials
In referring to runiform texts, scholars have often assumed that the voiced labial consonant in inscriptional Turkic is [b] wherever it appears, also between vowels. They give ‘äb’ ‘house, home’, for instance, where I write äv also when transcribing runiform texts, or ‘yabïz’ and not yavïz for ‘bad’. It was Thomsen who chose this rendering, presumably in view of the principle that the runiform characters b¹ and b² should be transcribed the same way wherever they appear; he was followed e.g. by Tekin 1968: 7. I find myself in agreement with Clauson 1962: 77 and Zieme 1969: 36 in this matter. Since there is no runiform character for [v]¹⁰⁴ (or for [f]), there is no solid basis for Thomsen’s assumption, as the users of the alphabet had no choice but to use the b letters; nor was any additional letter needed for any relevant phonemic distinction. Unless proven otherwise, I therefore take the realisation of this phoneme in runiform sources (some of which were, after all, not older than some mss. written in Uygur script) not to differ from that of other Turkic languages retaining the labial in such words (especially not from Old Uygur). A number of scholars have taken the realisation as b (even between vowels) to be one of the characteristics of the oldest (Orkhon Turkic) stage of Old Turkic, and then assumed a passage b > v in the transition to the second oldest stage; this characterisation of the earliest Old Turkic is, I think, fictitious. The fact that the runiform script is unable to distinguish between a stop and a fricative cannot be a reason for assuming that there was only one realisation each of b¹ and b².

The non-plosive main allophone of the voiced-lenis consonant could in principle have been a labio-dental ([v], voiced counterpart of [f]), a bilabial fricative continuant ([β], the voiced counterpart of [φ], the blowing sound) or a bilabial flap ([w]). [w] appears not to have been meant when the Uygurs used the letter beth for writing it both in the Uygur and in the Manichaean script:¹⁰⁵ wów is in fact also used as consonant – rarely and only in foreign words; e.g. waxšig ‘demon’ e.g. in ManUigFr r1 (Manichaean) or TT V

¹⁰⁴ This might speak for a Semitic origin for the script, as no early Semitic languages or writing systems possessed a v as distinct from b, though they did possess a w (which could also serve as mater lectionis for rounded vowels). Semitic scripts in use for writing Old Turkic do use W when rendering the consonant [w] in borrowings and the like (see below). The Indic Devanāgarī script also only has two and not three characters to represent the labial oral consonants.

¹⁰⁵ Gabain used the letter w for [v], following German orthography, and the letter v for [w] in her publications, including her text editions and grammar (1941, 1974). Hamilton uses β in his transliterations of the oral weak labial.
B 124 (Buddhist), *widvag* ‘chapter’ (Saddh 30 and two other places\(^\text{106}\) mentioned in the note thereto), *tawčay* ‘sedan chair’ e.g. in HTs VII 1111, *lenxwa* ‘lotus’, *narwan* ‘elm’ (ManUigFr r4) or the divinity name ãźrwa. Such spelling is quite consistent, indicating that words were probably actually pronounced with a bilabial voiced consonant at least by some individuals. Runiform O / U is also used in this way: Cf. *kew(a)n* ‘Saturn’ in Blatt 10 and cf. the remark on this on p. 298 of the edition (p.607 of the reedition). Note that this /w/ could appear both at the onset and coda of syllables. The interjection *awu* also has the sound [w], but interjections often contain sounds not otherwise used.

The DLT distinguishes (fol.26) between consonantal wōw and thrice-dotted fā, which is said to have been pronounced ‘between the points of articulation’ of fā and bā; the Oğuz are said to pronounce wōw where the other Turks have the three-dot fā. Dankoff & Kelly p.55, who discuss the instances where this is defined and used, take the three-dot fā to refer to a bilabial which they transcribe as w, while they take the letter wōw to refer to a labiodental voiced consonant, [v]. They base their argument on the fact that the Oğuz and the Persians nowadays pronounce the sound as [v]; therefore, they think, this must also have been what Kāšgarī meant with wōw. Borovkova 1966 (supported by Doerfer 1993: 52) had held the opposite opinion, taking wōw to have been used with the sound value which it has in normal Arabic. My use of the letter v to refer to this phoneme also when quoting the DLT should not be understood as implying a choice for one of the three possible pronunciations mentioned above. u ‘sleep’ is spelled as uv once in U III; uvšat-, uvšan- and uvšal- ‘to crumble (tr. and intr.)’ and uvšak ‘petty’ are, on the other hand, often spelled without v (with ugak ‘mortar’ from the same root), and kuvrat- ‘to assemble (tr.)’ is sometimes spelled as kurat-. Cf. su < sport ‘water’ in Dhašu 36. This would speak for a bilabial pronunciation of /v/ at least after /u/. The Manichæan and Uygur script use of wōw exclusively for transcribing [w] in foreign words clearly speaks for a labiodental pronunciation of normal Old Turkic /w/.

In the word onset [b] could, as an alternative to being an allophone of /v/, be assigned to the phoneme /p/; this would correct the system asymmetry following from the absence of [p] in this position in original

\(^{106}\) One of these has now been shown by Zieme to be a Vimalakirtinirdeśa fragment and not Manichæan, as Maue & Rührborn thought. Zieme proposes (SIAL 18 (2003): 147) yörjūg *widvag* but böljūg *widvag* would be better: *widvag* here (as elsewhere in Uygur) does not signify ‘interpretation, explanation’, the primary meaning in the source language Sogdian, but ‘chapter’, the second meaning it has in Sogdian.
Turkic words though all the other unvoiced phonemes except /ʃ/ do appear in onset position. Several modern (e.g. Siberian) Turkic languages have just this postulated /p/ in onset position (with sporadic appearance of #p in some other Turkic languages, e.g. Turkish). Brāhmī mss. also use the letter p more often than b and bh for [b], proving at least that the phonemic load on the distinction between these was not very important to the scribes. The fact that the Uygur script has Semitic and Sogdian pe for [b] supports this idea but is no automatic proof for it: Sogdian used Semitic beth (as well as gimel) to represent fricatives and not stops, and [b] is no fricative. The Manichaean writing system does use Semitic beth to render [b], using beth with two superscribed dots to write [v]. The [v : b] opposition seemed more worthy of explicit representation than the [p : b] opposition to those adapting the Sogdian alphabet to Old Turkic, but the [p : b] opposition was treated as the more essential one by the adapters of the Manichaean script to this language. The fact that the runiform script, which was in use both in Mongolia and in East Turkestan, used the two b runes after vowels for what appears as [v] in all Turkic languages and also for representing the labial stop in the onset of words strongly speaks against the possibility that the Old Turkic labial in this position was a [p].

Uygur /v/ appears to remain a fricative even after /l/, as shown by instances of the suffix -vI (q.v. in OTWF section 3.115) and by such stems as alvïr 'to rave' (near-minimal pair with alpïrka 'to find something difficult'), arvï 'doubt', yelvi 'magic', etc. Instances of the realisation of /v/ as [b] beside /l/ are discussed in section 2.409.

The realisation of /p/ between vowels is not very clear. On the one hand we have two words in Indic scripts which show b between vowels: koburga ‘owl’ in TT VIII O4 and abag ‘sheltered’ from the stem api- in TT VIII I 4 and BuddhKat 20 (in both cases with lowering of the /ï/ due to the adjacent /g/). This labial must be an allophone of /pl/, as the...

107 Uygur texts do have it there in numerous borrowings from Sanskrit, Chinese etc.; see section 2.404 for what cannot appear in the onset and for possible reasons.

108 Cf. Róna-Tas 1991: 83: ‘Onset b is as a rule transcribed with p-. In the manuscripts F, H and I we find as a rule bh-. The manuscript K has in most cases ph-. The writing with b- is relatively rare, but occurs in the most frequent words such as bilig, bilge, baš, beš. The word burxan is always written with b-, and in the two manuscripts where we find also p-(A, E) it occurs together with forms written with b-.’

109 These two dots are occasionally dropped, making [v] appear as b, e.g. in suv ‘water’ spelled as sub, or in the noun kîv in BT V 134. Three lines further, in BT V 137, the dots are there, however, making it likely that in this passage, as in texts in Manichaean script in general, the omission is merely graphic and is not to be understood as reflecting pronunciation.
voiced oral labial would in this position be realised as [v]. On the other hand we have tupulgak / topolgak 'cyperus' attested with p in Brāhmī script (TT VIII M29 and ms. Mz 202 r1). Concerning Old Turkic töpō 'hill', tapa 'towards', tapīn- 'to worship', tap-īg 'service', topol- 'to pierce', kapar- 'to swell up, form a blister', kapag / kapīg 'gate', kopuz 'stringed instrument', kōpīk / kōpīk 'foam', sipir- 'to sweep', yīpär 'musk' or the DLT's tüpi 'a high wind', sapan 'a plough', tapan 'the sole of the foot or a boot' or čipık 'a stick' no evidence is known to me of a pronunciation with [b].

[f] is an allophone of both /p/ and /v/ appearing before /š/: yafšur- < yap-šür- 'to stick or fasten something onto something else', e.g., is spelled with F in Pothi 127; this text is in Manichaean writing, which has a special character for [f]. The form spelled as yavšuru (< yap-š-) in ShōAgon 1,365 has the same meaning; using Semitic B (which signals a voiced labial fricative in Uygur as in Sogdian), the scribe might actually have meant [f]. He may, however, also really have been thinking of [v]: Kāšgārī (fol.485) states that the verb has the shape yapcūr- but that there is a variant which he spells with WJ instead of BJ adding that this is pronounced with fā'. Dankoff & Kelly think that what he means is [w] because they believe Kāšgārī pronounced wāw the Persian way, as [v]. They may be wrong, as [f] and [v] share the feature of labiodental articulation as against kapšur- (not 'kabšur-', as transcribed), appearing in BT III 935 beside kavšur- elsewhere in that text. tapšur- 'to hand over' is also likely to have been pronounced as tafšur-, but tapčur- in DLT fol. 354 shows that the Qarakhanid dialect did not participate in such a development; in that source we also find the variant kikšur- < kikšur-. p > f and k > x, which both take place before /š/, are attested only in back-harmony syllables. The runiform, Uygur, Brāhmī and Tibetan scripts have no character for [f].

[f] is otherwise found in borrowings; a very well attested one is frīšti 'angel' spelled with v (Semitic B) e.g. in ManUigFr r3. The note to BT V 241, where frīšti is also attested, lists the four ways in which the first sound of this word is spelled in Uygur writing: either with B (one

110 koberga could be read with p in DLT fol. 245, where Dankoff & Kelly write b; Kāšgārī uses bā also to represent the sound [p]. See OTWF for Uygur instances of api- and apīt- not mentioned in the EDPT or the UW. The latter writes aŋ and aŋītmaŋz with b, which is justified by the Brāhmī spelling, while api- etc. is phonemic.

111 If Turkish has kabar-, saban and çubak this is because these words had long vowels in their first syllables in Proto-Turkic and Proto-Oguz.

112 Note, though, that the verb āvīr- is also spelled with F in TT IX 117, also in Manichaean writing.
example beside the one just mentioned) or with P with a pair of dots over or under the letter or (most commonly) with a line under the letter P. The word spelled as Porom in KT E 4 and BQ E 5 in fact represents Forom, coming from From, the Parthian form of the name of (East) Rome or Byzantium. In runiform mss. it is the characters b₁ and b₂ (also used for writing /v/) rather than p (as in the inscriptions) that are used for rendering [f].

We had, in the table, given /p/ and /v/ as unvoiced and voiced oral labial consonants respectively. With the addition of foreign words we get /p/ and /v/ as unvoiced and voiced oral bilabial consonants (/m/ presumably also being bilabial and voiced) and /f/ and /v/ as unvoiced and voiced oral labiodentals respectively.

2.32. The alveolars

It is clear that Old Turkic had a /t/; the question is whether the voiced counterpart of this was /d/ and not /ð/ in the whole of Old Turkic. The Proto-Turkic voiced alveolar might have been /ð/, seeing that this is what appears in Sayan Turkic, and that the Proto-Turkic phoneme fused with /t/ in Yakut. A change *ð > d is, however, possible even between vowels under substrate or adstrate influence, and the Yakut development is secondary in any case. Evidence will be presented below for the thesis that the main allophone of the voiced alveolar consonant was [d] and not [d] in all Old Turkic including Orkhon Turkic (against the view of T. Tekin and some others). The runiform and the Uygur and Sogdian scripts have two characters to represent the non-nasal alveolars, the phonemes referred to above as /t/ and /ð/; the Semitic scripts use the Semitic tau or teth character for the former and lamed for the latter. Semitic daleth is not used at all in Sogdian and Uygur writing and is in Manichæan script used only after n. The runiform script has, in addition, two ligatures, one to express an /l/ followed by an alveolar, the other an /n/ followed by an alveolar. The Qarakhanid authors writing in Arabic script had at their disposal three letters (here disregarding the glottalised consonant characters) to represent non-nasal alveolars, ā, āl and ālāl. These three letters can be said to reflect a differentiation along two trait distinctions: ā is voiceless or fortis while āl and ālāl are voiced or lenis; alternately, ā and āl are stops while ālāl is a continuant. Dealing with the distinction which the DLT makes between ālāl and ālāl, Dankoff & Kelly 1982: 55-56 find that there is a lot of fluctuation between the two; cf. examples such as 10 times bodūn vs. 17 times bodun in their footn. 80. The reason for
this can very well be graphic, as the graphic difference consists of a superscribed dot; such diacritics of the Arabic writing system notoriously get lost in the mss. whatever the language.\footnote{The authors consider two other possibilities: "2) the phoneme was between [d] and [ḍ], and Kāšgarī uses D and K interchangeably to indicate it ...; 3) the wavering reflects dialect mixture."} Note, on the other hand, that there are e.g. nearly 50 instances of ḏadak and not a single adak in the DLT. The QB mss. sometimes differ among themselves in this respect, e.g. often writing kādaš where C has kadaš. As Dankoff & Kelly 1982: 55 note, Kāšgarī explicitly mentions a d ~ ẓ alternation in connection with two words and in at least three places in the Divān has separate subheadings for the two letters; he also states that those dialects which change ḏ to ẓ also change d to y. All these bits of information do not prove that there were two distinct voiced oral alveolar phonemes. Most authorities describing Old Turkic spoke of d and not of ḏ. I think the main allophone of the single voiced non-nasal alveolar was /ɓ/. I agree in this with Johanson 1979 and Sims-Williams 1981, scholars of quite different background and outlook who reached this opinion independently.\footnote{Sims-Williams (1981: 354), unaware of Johanson 1979, writes: "Further arguments could be adduced, but I hope that those already mentioned will be sufficient to indicate the desirability of a reconsideration of the whole question by a competent Turcologist."} Sims-Williams’ arguments are based mainly on the fact that lamed never denoted a stop in Sogdian, the language from which the Uygurs got their main alphabet. The main point in Johanson’s thought is that suffixes like +dA (locative), -dAčI (future participle) or -dXm etc. (past tense), which normally have the d runes, write these suffixes with the t runes when they are preceded by /rl n/ and rarely /zl/ (unless, in the case of l or n, there is a ligature). Variants of suffixes starting with the voiced alveolar are dealt with singly in the morphology chapter of this book; it turns out that different suffixes behave differently, some of them showing the stop allophone only after /l n/ and some after /t/ and even (rarely) /zl/ as well. Johanson states that the t runes in these cases do not represent a different phoneme but the stop (i.e. [d]) allophone of /ɓ/. Other languages where the main allophone of the voiced oral alveolar is a fricative, like Greek and Spanish, do the same when this phoneme appears after /nl/. The ligatures are, accordingly, to be read neither as ‘[nt, lt]’ nor as ‘[n ḏ, l ḏ]’ but as [nd, ld]. See section 2.409 below for further discussion of the phonotactic aspects of this matter. The evidence for these sounds to be gleaned from Brāhmī mss. has been discussed most authoritatively (and based on the widest evidence) by
Sources also appear to distinguish between these three alveolar sounds, using the letters or letter sequences tt or td, t, dh, d and a special additional character serving in some manuscripts in the same way as dh serves in the others. tt and td clearly represent [t], t is [t] or [d], and dh or the special character represent [d] or [Ø]. The letter d, which is only used in the ligature nd, is not relevant if, as Maue 1983: 55 n.11 thinks, it was preferred over nt because nt looked so similar to tt. Relevance does become evident, however, if one remembers that the Manichaean script uses daleth only after nun, and that one of the three sonant + consonant characters of the runiform script links the alveolar with /n/.

The alternative view (which we find e.g. in Tekin 1968) takes runiform writing at face value, stating that the opposition between /d/ in /t/ is neutralised after /r l n/ in favor of /t/:

This is, it is there said, what happens in Chuvash, where Proto-Turkic /d/ coalesced with /t/ everywhere except after /r l n/, in which position it becomes /t/. The fact is, however, that Chuvash /t/ is, in this position as between vowels, pronounced as a weak stop. This is also what might have happened at some stage in Old Uygur: If /t/ acquired a voiced allophone in certain positions, the [d] allophone of /d/ might, e.g. at the stage when the mss. begin to use the t and d characters interchangeably, have joined the phoneme /t/. T.Tekin 1968: 7 takes the stop pronunciation of adak ‘foot’ or tod- ‘to be satiated’ to be characteristic of Orkhon Turkic, assuming these to have become adak and tod- respectively in subsequent stages of the language. This assumption need not be made for Orkhon Turkic, as the script did not have the possibility of distinguishing between the two alveolars (as it was also unable to distinguish between [b] and [v] and between [g] and [y]). The suffixes +dA, -dOk etc. have to be distinguished from suffixes like -tUr-, which originally started with /t/ and show T in all positions in Orkhon Turkic; when they appear with D in late Uygur, this is the result of voicing assimilation coming up at that stage.115

2.33. The palatals

115 The remaining problem is why +dA, +dAn, -dAdl, -dOk, -dIl etc. surface with /d/ and not /y/ in all those Middle and Modern Turkic languages which turned all [Ø] to /y/ within and at the end of stems although [Ø] is supposed to be their main allophone. The answer given by Johanson 1979: 52, that a locative suffix ‘+yA’ would get confused with the dative is not convincing because 1) the dative has this shape in quite a small part of the Turkic world, 2) no similar explanation holds for any of the other suffixes mentioned, and 3) case suffixes have been known to disappear because of diachronic sound laws. Rather, at some stage, presumably already in varieties of Old Turkic, [d] was generalised at the onset of syllables or at least suffixes.
Old Turkic /y/ is a consonant and not a semivowel alternate of /i/. When a stem ends in /y/, a 3rd person possessive suffix following it starts without onset /s/, and if a suffix (e.g. -(X)t- or -(A)Ilm) starting with a vowel follows it, the vowel is not dropped. Vowels + /y/ give diphthongs neither in originally Turkic nor in borrowed elements.¹¹⁶

/y/ is not the direct voiced counterpart of /ɛ/, which is an affricate starting with [t] whereas the former is a fricative. Proto-Turkic onset /y/ does, however, appear as the voiced affricate [j] in a number of Turkic languages including Volga Bulgarian, and also in cognates in Mongolic (which itself does have onset /y/ beside onset /ɬ/ in original Mongolic words with no Turkic counterparts).¹¹⁷ Whether Old Turkic speakers also pronounced the affricate [j] (the voiced counterpart of /ɛ/) in any context is unknown; this may have been the case e.g. with važir 'vajra', which is often also spelled with C: [j] may for some have been less unpronounceable than [ž]. We do not know exactly how /ɛ/ was pronounced. The sequence /ts/ appears to have become /ɛ/ in stücü- 'to be sweet and pleasant' (Qarakhanid) and stüčig 'sweet' (found already in Orkhon Turkic; late meaning 'sweet wine'), since they probably come from *stü+si- 'to be like milk'.¹¹⁸ In TT IX 24 /ɛ/ is, Manichaean writing, spelled with the letter Z.

éčänîçig appears as variant of yalin+lîç 'brilliant' in completely fragmented context, followed by a lacuna, in BT XIII 5,188 and also, in the binome éčänîçig çoglug, in ShôAv XIIa9. This spelling may be the result of reborrowing from Mongolian, where yalin appears as jal(i)n), and/or çoglug (which may possibly have stood in the lacuna also in BT XIII) may have had some alliterative influence. Zieme invokes the appearance of ɛç for Old Turkic (and Oguz etc.) yɛ in some modern languages, but this word by itself is not enough for assuming that there was such a dialect also among the users of Old Turkic texts.

/i/ could have been either a palatalised nasal as in Dolgan or a nasalised [y] as in Yakut (both Lena Turkic languages); it is retained also in Tofa. Our evidence for this phoneme is rather scanty: Among the original stock we can discern, perhaps, one suffix, one pronoun, eight nouns and adjectives, three verb stems, the proper name Tuñukok

¹¹⁶ Editors nowadays adapt the spelling of borrowed words to what is known about Old Turkic phonotactics. Only mayтри, the Uygur name of the future Buddha Maitreya, is still transcribed ‘traditionally’, as “maitri”.

¹¹⁷ It is not clear on what base Johanson 2001: 1723b assumes the existence of ʃj/ in “Ost-Alttürkisch” (as he calls the language).

¹¹⁸ This is made likely in OTWF 204 and 534; cf. Persian sūr, sweet’ < sūr, milk’ and the fact that Turkmen sūyt and sūyji both have long vowels.
and the ethnic name Kïtañ. A character for this sound exists only in the runiform script; the palatal nasal of the Indic writing systems is not used for representing it. Runiform sources (listed in Clauson 1962: 91) have /ň/ (beside proper names) in the diminutive suffix +kIñA and in the stems aňïg ‘bad’, ĕigañ ‘destitute’, turňa ‘crane’,¹¹⁹ kaňu ‘which’, koň ‘sheep’ (also in koňči) and yaň- ‘to disperse’. However, a Turfan fragment (MIK III 34b = T II T 20 in KöktüTurf, p. 535 in SEddTF) listing runiform characters together with their pronunciation in Manichæan script in fact gives ‘YY (to be read iy or iy) for the runiform character ņ. This could mean that there was a transitional stage, in which this character was still known and could still be used when writing in runiform script, but its pronunciation had changed. Therefore, if we find a word spelled with runiform ņ, this in itself does not guarantee nasal pronunciation, and the convergence of /ň/ with /y/ may partly have taken place earlier than assumed hitherto. Alternatively, the author of this fragment may have felt y to be the representation closest to the nasalised voiced palatal consonant he knew.

In Old Turkic written with other alphabets, */ň/ in most texts becomes y. turňa ‘crane’, e.g., appears as turya in TT VIII P 29; Zieme’s correct interpretation of this is quoted in SIAL 17 (2002): 83 (footn. 43). There are, however, conspicuous exceptions: A few Manichæan mss. have the digraph NY also in Semitic writing systems. We find it in bir+kînyä ‘single’ (M I 23,32) and in kanyu in Wettkampf 43, six times in the London scroll of TT VI (according to Laut 1986: 81), Pañe 192 and ManTüFr 7, with an additional 10 examples for kanyu mentioned in the note to this latter instance. Two of these examples appear in a Buddhist fragment quoted in the n. to TT V A 23, showing that the retention of /ň/ was not limited to Manichæan sources (as generally thought).¹²⁰ The spelling ‘NY’ for ‘evil’ in Manichæan script in the X astvänift, 21 times in Uygur script in the TT VI London scroll (again according to Laut) and no doubt elsewhere as well can be read either as anîg or as aň(î)g, depending on whether one believes that /ň/ lived on unchanged in this text or that it became /ñ/. In mss. in Uygur writing, this may also be a misreading of a(ŷ)îg, when the editor assumes defective spelling of a with a single alef, since N and alef mostly look the same in that script

¹¹⁹ I do not think the spelling with ņY in the IrkB indicates a pronunciation placing ņ and Y into separate syllables: There are in that text many instances of a double sign being redundantly accompanied by a simple one, e.g. Türk getting spelled with the character for rounded front vowels followed by “k. turňa is probably just to be read as turňa (or possibly as turňa in view of some modern forms).

¹²⁰ kanyuda has also been read in U II 6,13, also Buddhist, but the ms. is now lost.
(see also the UW entry ayîg). We encounter similar problems with *köñ- 'to burn (intr.)', the other verb ending in /ñ/, whose -Ur- derivate seems to be attested with NY, YN, Y or N in Manichæan sources (see OTWF). The only example which may have to be read as anîg because there is a superfluous alef after the N appears in Fedakâr 549 (Sogdian script) in very fragmentary context; the Y is also damaged. kûnaš 'a sunny place' in IrqB 57 is an exception, explained through contamination with kûn 'sun': This runiform ms. otherwise consistently retains /ñ/, in koñ, anîg, turña and čigañ. We encounter similar problems with *köñ- 'to burn (intr.)', the other verb ending in /ñ/, whose -Ur- derivate seems to be attested with NY, YN, Y or N in Manichæan sources (see OTWF). The only example which may have to be read as anîg because there is a superfluous alef after the N appears in Fedakâr 549 (Sogdian script) in very fragmentary context; the Y is also damaged. kûnaš 'a sunny place' in IrqB 57 is an exception, explained through contamination with kûn 'sun': This runiform ms. otherwise consistently retains /ñ/, in koñ, anîg, turña and čigañ.121
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121 Uygur otherwise has kuvâsh < *kuñaš, which lives on as kuñaš ‘warm weather’ in Yakut and Dolgan. The IrqB form conforms with Xaladj künäš in Brähmi writing as it is spelled in Uygur scripts, I do not think its pronunciation as a single syllable containing a nasal stretch or feature can be doubted.

122 koyn in BuddhKat 20 is not the nominative, as he thinks, but the accusative form of stem + possessive suffix; the passage reads atîn, adgîrin, koyîn yikîrin ... idalayur. This rather early source has progressive -sA instead of the conditional suffix -sAr, and koyn ‘sheep’ could be another progressive feature; but then, [ñ] could also have been a too difficult a task to tackle in the Tibetan transcription. In Brähmi there are several instances of the word, all spelled koyn.

123 In TT VIII P, reedited together with an additional fragment in Maue 2002. The 1st person singular modal suffix is also practically always spelled with final YN.

124 It follows from the Brähmi spelling in Maue 1996 Nr:44 b B 8 that Uygur muyuz had back vowels (and not front ones as written in the EDPT); spellings in Uygur writing are ambiguous.
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ancestors of the Khaladj, whose dialect has a where Proto-Turkic had *ñ. The shape of *yuñ 'peacock' follows form Uygur yuy (twice ūv and twice Pañcaraks) and the DLT's (twice) yun. Above, we had seen that turňa 'crane' became turya in Uygur, as still today in Tuvan; in Qarakhanid this bird name as well became turna (DLT fol.550 and QB 74 and 5377), as in Oguz, Kipchak and South-Eastern Turkic.

The diminutive suffix +kIñA became +kIyA (spelled as +kyA) in most of Old Uygur. It has been assumed since Gabain's first treatment of the dialect question that the passage ñ > n had taken place in some Uygur sources as well, but this hardly seems to be the case. She bases her idea among other things on two TT I words which she read as containing the diminutive suffix +kInA, but these subsequently turned out to be misreadings of +kI+čA. azkïna 'quite little' appears with /n/ in two Uygur (U 139 v5 in the note to BT V 175 in Manichaean script, and KP 7,6) instances, but the UW quotes dozens of others which have /yl/. There also are two QB instances of azkïna (3964 and 5440 in all three mss.) and cf. azrakkïna in QB 6633 in both mss. The scribe in DLT fol.601 seems to have done the appropriate thing when, in a quatrain rhyming sözkiyä, tuzkïya and közkiyä he adds dots for ñ on the first and third word without crossing out the dots for yä; all dots seem to be by the first hand. The */ñ/ in this suffix appears to have an exceptional history in any case, as it turns up as +kInA in Middle and Modern Kipchak and in South Eastern Turkic, whereas other original /ñ/ s appear as /y/ in those branches of Turkic. If +kIñA had become +kIyA among the ancestors of the speakers of Middle or Modern Kipchak languages or Uzbek or Uygur, they could not have reversed the process; there must have been one or more populous dialects where this suffix was retained with some sort of nasal.

Secondary /ny/, the sequence of two phonemes, also got simplified to /yl/ in Qarakhanid, as shown by the shape of -yOk derivates of bases ending in /ñ/: ögrïyïk 'custom' from ögrän-, bulgayok 'confused' from bulgan-, osayok from osan- and sarkïyok from sarkïn-; verbs of the shape ‘ögrä-’, ‘osa-’ and ‘sarkï-’ are not attested and bulganyok is lexi-

---

125 Doerfer considers this language to be new Argu, as it were, but material in Sims Williams 2000 shows that Turkic Khaladj lived as a nation in Northern Afghanistan already before the appearance of the Argu in the sources.

126 Cf. Zieme 1969: 226 for a probable Mongolian cognate. Dankoff & Kelly read the DLT word as yin and are followed by Hauenschild 2003: 249-250. The EDPT (entry yin) is wrong in stating that 'there is no native Turkish word for 'peacock'

127 Another exception is tur(u)ña 'crane', mentioned above; contiguity with /l/ may there be the reason.
calised already in Uygur. If the DLT’s kayak and Argu kanak (Middle and Modern Turkic kaynak except kanak in Khaladj) go back to kayna- ‘to boil’ and the base of kayıntur- as suggested in Doerfer 1993: 130, then the source of the n ~ y alternation should, in this word, also not come from /n̥/ but from the phoneme sequence /yn/ or even /ym/.

One piece of evidence for original *ñ as second consonant are those cases where there is, in an originally Turkic word, /m/ at the beginning of a word without there being a nasal following it. Such cases are Uygur moyum ‘confused’, muyuz ‘horn’, mayak ‘dung’, the DLT’s mayïl ‘overripe’ and its cognates, muyga ‘headstrong’ and muygak ‘female maral deer’. Uygur meji ‘brain’ corresponds to meji in the DLT, mänä in the QB, both attested solidly; I do not think that this should make us posit ‘*ȳ’ as an additional phoneme for Proto-Turkic, as is believed by some: Note that *buñuz also became müûz or muyuz in the latest Uygur and in the DLT, but cf. Chuvash möyraka (with diminutive suffix). The b > m change thus gives us an indication for the original state of affairs in stems starting with labials. The number of */ñ/s which we do not know about because the stem started with /l/, /k/, /k/ or vowel, not being attested in the earliest texts or in Khaladj must, taken together, have been much greater. In a Yenisey inscription we find tañ+larïm ‘my colts’. This noun is otherwise attested in the DLT and the QB, in Middle and Modern Turkic but not in Uygur; generally it has the shape tay and Yakut has tïy. Had it not been for this one inscription, we would not have known of the possibility that the word may have had a palatal nasal; this is a matter of coincidence. In view of the state the Yenisey inscriptions are in, the Ñ may also be error.

To sum all this up from the dialectological point of view, post-inscriptional Turkic had varieties in which /n̥/ was in some form or other retained as an independent phoneme; elsewhere it became /yn/ or fused with the phonemes /n/ or /y/. ñ > n is attested in Argu and Khaladj, for two nouns in Qarakhanid; +kňA had a special development. In Uygur /n̥/ was gradually reduced to /y/ with fluctuations, but there was no n dialect within Uygur. Wherever scholars have found an N for *ñ in Uygur, there practically always is a Y beside it, again giving /n̥/; assuming defective spelling (which is common in all texts and especially in the ones in question) the (in any case rather rare) instances for N can all, with one exception in Sogdian writing, be read as NY or YN. Clauson 1962: 118 had proposed that these NY, YN and N are all spellings for ǹ. Röhrborn 1981-82 accepted this view and further proposed that the Y < ǹ appearing in these texts should be read as [n̥] as well: I think the opposite is true: NY was, at any rate in mss. in
Manichaean and Uygur script, an archaic and obsolete spelling for what was presumably already being pronounced as [y] by most of the population. This could partly have been true even for the runiform mss., even if they consistently wrote Н.

2.34. The velars and */h/

The pronunciation of /k/ is likely to have been rather different in back-vowel and front-vowel surroundings, at that time as in most modern Turkic languages: All the writing systems of Semitic origin, all varieties of the runiform script as well as Old Turkic texts in the Northern Brāhmī used different letters to render these two. In the latter there are two traditions for rendering the guttural consonants, as shown by Maue 1985, both involving three signs: In one tradition, voiced and unvoiced are distinguished in the back-vowel domain, while front /k/ and /front /g/ go undistinguished. This is clearly influenced by the system of the Uygur script, where ġimel and ḥeth represent back-vowel /g/ and /k/ respectively in pre-classical Uygur texts, double-dotted ġimel-ḥeth assuming the task of [q] in Classical Uygur, whereas no voice distinction is made explicit among the front velars. We have the same situation in the Qarakhanid system, where ghain and qāf are voiced and voiceless respectively, whereas kāf also serves for /g/ in the front domain. In the other Brāhmī tradition, which is closer to phonological reality, back and front /k/ are distinguished, but not back and front /g/. In Tibetan writing, [q] is generally (but not in BuddhKat) spelled as GR at the beginning of words and syllables though not at the end of syllables. The hippological bilingual in southern Brāhmī (Emmerick & Róna-Tas) uses K both for front and back /k/, while BuddhKat often uses G for both at the onset of words.

Runiform Q rendered a fricative [x] especially in foreign words; e.g., in the Orkhon inscriptions, the proper name Maxaraç and the city name Buxaraq. The title kan was probably also pronounced as xan; the opposition kan ‘blood’ vs. xan ‘ruler’ must be considered a minimal pair, insofar as vowel length was no longer distinctive. xan may have been an early borrowing into Turkic from a language which died out without direct documentation, and is also the source of the second

---

128 I know of only one text in Uygur writing which uses K and X indiscriminately: HamTouHou 16, a letter written by an ambassador from Khotan to China, who appears not to have been all too familiar with Uygur spelling; it shows other irregularities as well, e.g. hešinciple ‘fifth’ written as PYSYC.

129 The word for ‘blood’ had a long vowel in Proto-Turkic.
syllable of *burxan* ‘Buddha’. Since *xan* must have been within the Old Turkic lexicon for centuries, we are entitled to consider it to be part of the legitimate base for determining the phoneme inventory. *[x]* would have been considered a phoneme if there had been more distinctive load on the opposition, if it had not been an allophone of */k/* and perhaps a free alternant as well. The voiceless velar may sometimes have been pronounced as a fricative also in front harmony words: We find a word for ‘breast-strap’ spelled as *kömüldrüx* with *H* in a list of hippological terms in Khotanese Brāhma (Khot 21).

The realization of Sanskrit *h* in loans in Uygur texts in Uygur script is explored by Röhrborn 1988. As he shows, it was spelled as *X* before the vowels */a u o/; before the vowels */i e/,* however, *K* was used to represent what had been Sanskrit *h*. The reason, probably, is that the sources of the Uygur *q* character are in fact the Semitic letters *gimel* and *heth,* which were in Sogdian used to express the voiced and the unvoiced velar fricatives respectively.131

When originally Sanskrit words containing the consonants */k/, *g/, *kh* or */gh/* appear in Uygur, they are spelled as *K* even when they share syllables with back vowels. Borrowed terms appear often to have been taken over through Sogdian, the script is in any case adapted from Sogdian and this is Sogdian spelling practice. The explanation proposed by Johanson 1993a: 96 that the Uygurs had used *K* and not *X* to represent the foreign unvoiced gutturals because they had felt them to be less velar than the back-vowel dorsal of their language (represented by *X*) may be just as valid. Röhrborn 1996 has a third explanation, that they were chosen because *caph* was unequivocally plosive while *gimel/heth* had primarily been fricative in Sogdian, was still so in Uygur in the voiced domain and partly also in its unvoiced counterpart ((*/q* ~ */x*/)). The Sogdians could in any case not have used *gimel* or *heth* for expressing stops as these letters exclusively represented fricatives in their language.132 Röhrborn states that the spelling rules of Old Turkic

---

130 The first syllable is said to come from an early Chinese pronunciation of this name (the modern Mandarin pronunciation being *fo*).

131 See Röhrborn 1996: 179-180 on this question. Röhrborn approvingly quotes Clauson 1962: 103 and 105, taking his side against Sims-Williams 1981: 355, n.26 on the matter of Clauson’s consistent reference to *gimel/heth* where Sims-Williams distinguishes between the instances of *gimel* and of *heth,* but Clauson was referring to Sogdian (and was wrong about that) whereas Röhrborn refers to the Uygur letter.

132 Such a situation has actually developed spontaneously in Modern Hebrew, where *qoph* is the only letter used for rendering foreign *[k]* although *caph* also most often is pronounced as *[k]*, because *caph* can also render the sound *[x]*; when quoting foreign
need not be expected to hold also for borrowings, since the coexistence in one word of velar characters respectively serving front and back harmony is possible only in them. While this is correct, I still see a problem with Röhrborn’s argument in the fact that the phenomenon is not limited to the Sogdian-Uygur alphabet but also appears in the Manichaean one, where both *caph* and *qoph* are used for both the front and the back velar (the latter dotted); but we find, in Manichaean writing, in M II 12,8, *trazuk ‘scales for weighing’* with front K. Suffixes added to borrowings were spelled the Turkish way, which lead to words like *(u)lok+ka ‘to the poem’ (< Skt. śloka) being spelled with K in the stem but X in the suffix. Cf. also Erdal 2002: 5-7.

In Turkic words [x] is, among other things, the allophone of /k/ in contiguity with /š/ in back-vowel words, e.g. in *oxša- ‘to caress’. The DLT fol.144 also spells *ogša- ‘to resemble’ (as well as a number of derivates from this verb) with *x̌*, but that is the result of assimilatory devoicing which appears to have been rare in Uygur.¹³³ There, this verb had a voiced velar fricative, *[v̌ša-]* presumably still differing in pronunciation from *oxša-. ogša- ‘to resemble’ is also spelled with *h* in at least six Brāhmi instances mentioned in OTWF 780, while we know from Windg 50 (Manichæan writing) that it there (still) was a voiced and not an unvoiced velar; Brāhmi *h* was also used for representing [y]. *takšur- ‘to compose verses’* was probably also pronounced as *taxšur-;* the velar hardly ever seems to be spelled with the *q* dots in Uygur writing. The same applies to the onomatopoetic verbs *kaxšašu čaxšašu yori- in Ht IV 1541, the base of the latter appearing as *čaxša- in DLT fol.569, and *sxšaš- ‘to get dense’ in Ht VIII 1838. Finally *yaxši ‘fine, appropriate’,* not attested before DLT and QB, clearly comes from *yak-iš- ‘to be suitable’. Sogdian *čyšpə, perhaps pronounced as *čxšpə, comes from Sanskrit šikšapada;* this may mean that the spirantisation of velars before /š/ may have been an areal phenomenon.

Zieme 1969: 36 gives a list of instances where *x* is written instead of *q* between vowels; these may either reflect a free alternation between stop and fricative, or they may be simple errors: Both in the Uygur and the Manichaean scripts, *x* differs from *q* only in that the former has one dot above the letter, the latter two.

Kāšāḡarī says that the Oğuz and Kipchak pronounce onset back-harmony k as [x] in such words as *xayu ‘which’, xanda ‘where’ and

---

¹³³ The EDPT is therefore probably wrong in spelling all Uygur instances of *ogša-* (discussed below) as *oxša- as well.
C H A P T E R  T W O

xizîm ‘my daughter’. Ottoman hangî and hani, Azeri hara ‘where’ and haysî ‘which’ show that there was such a process in the interrogatives; the velar of kîz is a fricative in Volga Bulgarian (late 13th century).

The realisation as stop (i.e. as [g] or even perhaps as [k]) after sonants is partly observable also for /g/ (and not only for /ð/), as indicated by the word spelled ârkî in the Örkhon inscriptions: Phonologically or at least morphophonologically speaking this is âr-ّgli with the participle suffix -(X)glI. What may have led to the pronunciation [ârkî] with [k] is the syllabification ârkîlî, Old Turkic having no coda cluster [rg]. If the first velar character in yapîrgak ‘leaf’ is double-dotted in HTs VIII 15, this can, however, very well mean that it was pronounced as a stop and not as a fricative, rather than pointing towards a pronunciation ‘yapîrkak’. Further instances to be considered in this connection are burkî ‘frowning; wrinkled (face)’ attested in Uygur, Brâhmî and Arabic script and formed with the formative -gî described in OTWF § 3.110, the particle ârki which has been proposed to come from âr- ‘to be’ by different suffixes starting with /g/, or the rather opaque kulkak < *kulgak ‘ear’. In other positions, the pronunciation of the soft velar appears to have been fricative. The /g/ of the words arît-gâlî ‘for cleaning’ and yumur tîga ‘egg’ is spelled with h in BuddhKat: This can just mean that /g/ was here pronounced as a fricative [ɣ], but it could also have been pronounced as [x]: To judge by the diacritics of the verbs agtur- ‘to raise’, agtîn- ‘to rise, climb, get to’ and agtar- ‘to throw, turn or roll something over, to translate’ in Uygur script and the Manîchiæn and Brâhmî spelling of agtîn-, their velar had already gotten devoiced in Uygur; evidence is discussed in the UW entries and in OTWF 586, 734. The DLT a number of times spells agtar- as axtar-. The Turkic-Khotanese hippological glossary also often spells /g/ as h after back vowels, e.g. in agzî‘mouth’, kîrîg ‘selvage of the saddle’, azîg ‘elephant tusk’ or kasiq ‘inside of the cheeks’ and even after front vowels, in yîg ‘bridle bit’, ilîg ‘attachment’, bügsîk ‘upper chest’ and bûgîr ‘kidney’. Editors often transcribe /g/ as g in words with front harmony but as γ in words with back harmony, implying that the back-harmonic variant of this phoneme was a spirant whereas the front variant was a stop. This practice reflects the spelling on the Semitic scripts adopted for Old Turkic: Semitic gimel was a velar spirant in Sogdian, the language from which the Uygurs took the script they used most often, whereas caph, which served for both front /k/ and /g/, represented a stop in Sogdian. Taking γ to symbolise a voiced velar fricative and an accent sign to symbolize palatal pronunciation, Doerfer’s ɣ and γ (as e.g. in Shor, or in Anatolian dialects retaining the
velar pronunciation of /g/ after vowels) are in fact probably more exact renderings of /g/ when not preceded by /r I n/.

As already noticed in OTWF 747, a number of verbs formed with the suffix +gAr- (with G documented as such in sources in runiform, Manichaean, brâhmi or Arabic script) are causative counterparts of +(X)k- verbs: äd+ik- > äd+gär- as dealt with in OTWF 743 and in the UW, iê+ik- ‘to submit, enter, capitulate’ > iê+gär- ‘to introduce, subdue, conquer’ and taš+ik- ‘to go or step out’ > taš+gar- ‘to bring, give or get out’ are formed with the addition of the causative suffix -Ar-. In and+gar- ‘to make somebody swear an oath’ < ant+ik- ‘to swear an oath’ and čin+gar- ‘to investigate something’ < čin+ik- ‘to be confirmed, found genuine’ the /g/ is solidly documented only by the DLT and further research is needed to determine whether especially čingar- and the petrified converb čingaru were pronounced as here spelled in Uygur as well. The alternation between the two velars is not necessarily one of voice; it may also be that G was chosen for the causative because the velar was, in this position, pronounced as a fricative and not as a stop. This, however, is only a hypothesis. The alternation is no doubt related to a distributional difference which we find in Orkhon Turkic\textsuperscript{134} concerning the appearance of the letters k and g after consonants within stems: /k/ is found practically exclusively after /r l/, in alkiin-, ilkı, kulkak, yilkı, arkı, arkıš, tarkan, tarkı̄mę, tokurkak, irkin, ārkli, ārkług. The only exception is yuyka, attested twice in Tuñ 13.\textsuperscript{135} No such limitations exist, on the other hand, for /g/: Beside lexemes with /lg/ such as bilğä, bulğa- or tolğat- and /rg/ such as kärgäk or tirğär- we also find ones such as iêgin-, adğır, üdğü, tamgäč̣, amğa, amğäk, ingäk, başgu, tavı̄šgan, boşgur- or kazgan-. There thus appears to have been a complementary distribution within stems, which does not hold before inflectional suffixes, but +gAr- clearly did not count as inflectional: The dative suffix is always spelled with K, e.g., while the directive suffix always has G.\textsuperscript{136} The phonemic opposition /k/ : /g/ is solid after vowels, e.g. in aği ‘generous, virtuous’ vs. agi ‘treasure’, āk- ‘to sow’ vs. āg- ‘to bend’

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[134] This is based on the documentation of Tekin 1968: 88-91; proper names and what I consider to be errors have been excluded.
\item[135] This shape of the word is isolated, as Old Uygur has yuka and Qarakhanid yuvka or yupka. The word is well attested in Middle and Modern Turkic languages but none show a y or any reflex of one. I don’t think one can take it to be a mason’s error if a word occurs twice, as assumed by EDPT 87a; it might be a dialect peculiarity, however, and is in any case likely to be secondary.
\item[136] See section 3.124 for a discussion of the nature of the velar of the dative suffix.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and oxša- ‘to caress’ vs. ogša- ‘to resemble’. However, it seems difficult to find such minimal pairs for other positions.

The alternation /ŋ/ – /ɡ/ (i.e. the neutralisation of the opposition of nasality in the velar domain) occurring in Orkhon Turkic is not a purely phonetic matter, as it there takes place only with the 2nd person possessive suffix (used also in the preterit suffix); it is documented in section 3.122. This is a dialect characteristic which, according to DLT fol.350, also occurs in some Argu dialects. It does not happen in the 2nd person plural imperative suffix (where /ŋ/ is in the coda as with the possessive singular), nor with the genitive (whose Orkhon Turkic variant after consonants is +Xŋ) nor, in Orkhon Turkic or in Uygur, in stems. As a quite different phenomenon, the Mait (as listed in Laut 1986: 71-74), the HamTouen text 18, a few Manichaean texts and the DLT sporadically spell /ŋ/ as K in Uygur and Arabic script (where this letter is used also for /g/). This is a purely graphic matter, as (front) K appears in back-vowel words as well. A few Uygur ms. (dealt with by P. Zieme in a lecture with the title ‘Gab es Entnasalisierung im Altuiquirischen?’ held at the VATEC symposium in Frankfurt, September 2002) spell [ŋ] as K with a superposed dot. Rarely, /ŋ/ and /ɡ/ do alternate in the DLT: ‘elephant’ there is ɣyaŋ (not among the Oguz) or ɣaŋ (cf. Uygur ɣaŋ); sā, ‘to you’ < sapa in DLT fol.536 and the address tārim < tāpurim in DLT fol.199 presumably passed through a stage with /ɡ/.

/ŋ/ does not consist of the sequence /ng/, although the Semitic writing systems spell it that way under front synharmonism. /n/ + /ɡ/ gives ɣŋ/ neither in stems like ɣŋaŋ ‘cow’, nor when a stem ending in /n/ is followed by suffix (e.g. the directive) starting with /ɡ/. This may have been different prehistorically in view of the fusion of +ɡArU with the 2nd and 3rd person possessive suffixes to give +XŋArU and +(s)ŋArU and taking ɣŋaŋ ‘finger’ and ɣŋaŋ ‘cheek-bone’ to come from arkan ‘men’ and yan ‘side’ respectively. 137 Cf. also kāliŋ ‘my daughters-in-law’ in Orkhon Turkic KT N9, assuming kālin ‘daughter-in-law’ + collective suffix +(A)ɡU + pronominal /n/ + 1st person possessive suffix (which is not completely regular, as the collective suffix otherwise loses its first vowel only after vowels). The 2nd or 3rd person possessive suffixes in the dative case, +(X)ŋA and +(s)ŋA, show an otherwise unattested prehistorical contraction /nk/ > ɣŋ/.

There is no doubt that Proto-Turkic had an */h/ phoneme in the word onset; this */h/ is retained systematically in Khaladj and sporadically in

137 See OTWF 75 for these etymologies and cf. OTWF 165-166 for oŋay ‘easy’.
other modern languages, and has left reflexes in Old Turkic. The matter is dealt with in Doerfer 1980 (text of a lecture presented in 1976; German translation Doerfer 1995), who showed that /h/ appeared in some words which became parts of ethnonyms appearing in a Tibetan document from the 8th century (see below) and that an Old Turkic onset alternation yĩ ~ ũ is a reflex of */h/. Doerfer 1980/1995 only deals with cases where the vowel preceding sporadic /y/ is ũ, e.g. (y)ĩga‘ tree’, (y)ĩgla- ‘to weep’ or (y)ũrak ‘far’. Sporadic /y/ does, however, appear also before other high vowels: We have yũn- ‘to come up’ in Blatt 16 and 22 where most sources have ũn-. ũrt- ‘to cover’ has a variant yũrt- in yũrţũn (Mait 167 v 31) and yũrt-ũl- (Maue 1996, Mz 652 = T II S 19 b v 4 in Brâhmi). Uygur yũrg- ‘cord, cable’ corresponds to Qarakhanid yũrg; on the other hand, Uygur yũrïg ‘rotten’ corresponds to the DLT’s irïg (twice). Another term twice appearing with h° in that source is the title known well as irki from Orkhon Turkic and Qarakhanid sources. The itinerary is not written in Turkic but in Tibetan, which could have borrowed them at an earlier stage or from a dialect (like Khaladj) which did (unlike Old Turkic as attested in the sources) regularly retain /h/. Doerfer 1981-82a has argued that Orkhon Turkic also had /h/ as an actual sound, from the fact that the runiform character A sometimes (but not always) appears in the onset when comparative evidence makes us expect a word to start with a, but never when it makes us expect that a word starts with hũ. This argument does not really seem to be convincing, as the data he adduces are scant and inconclusive. Is there any proof that this h did not exist as such in Old Turkic, then? The runiform and Uygur script just had no such character, and the y ~ ũ alternation, which is a rather common reflex of */h/ in Uygur (including

138 yũrïg / irïg comes from Qarakhanid iri- / Uygur yirïi- ‘to decay, rot’ and may be related to yũrïg ~ irïg ‘pus’.

139 With other words in the itinerary, among them Ho-ũr-hor referring to the Uygurs (= Hui hu in Modern Mandarin Chinese, Hayhurlar in the late Kaš Xatun text presented by Peter Zieme in Mainz in 2002), matters are a bit more complicated.
the runiform manuscripts), does not appear to take place in the inscriptions of the Türk and Uygur kaghanates. The Manichæan script did have a letter for this sound: We find it several times in the Xw in the Parthian sentence man astar hirza ‘Forgive my sins!’ and also, without phonetic value, to fill in the ends of lines (e.g. közünür+tä+kih ‘the present’ in TT IX 46) or before holes in pothi leaves (e.g. burxan+lar+kah in TT IX 52). The Xw sentence is an instance of code switching (or it may have been an unintelligible formula for some of the lay people) and the words cannot be treated as borrowing. One might think that [h] should have appeared explicitly in texts written in Manichæan script if original Old Turkic words had retained it in these sources. However, the Uygur, Manichæan and Syriac scripts were all taken over from the Sogdians, whose language had lost this sound: Doerfer mentions Sogdian * fatt corresponding to Persian haft etc. So we get no help in this question from Manichæans and Christians. Then the scripts of Indic origin should have been explicit about this sound if the individuals using them had had h°, but we find that the relevant characters are not used. Words in texts in Brāhmī script spell the relevant words without H, with the exception of the word hūkùn ‘heap’. Doerfer already noted that the small texts in Tibetan script dealt with by Clauson do not show onset /h/ and says that these and the Brāhmī texts are late. Nor, crucially, does the presumably 10th century Buddhist catechism in Tibetan script have the letter h in Turkic words: adak ‘foot’, adïr- ‘to separate’, ag- ‘to change’, oğ ‘house’, oğrï ‘thief’, öl ‘wet’, ölä- ‘to die’, üz- ‘to rend’ are here spelled without initial H although their Khalaj cognates do start with h; ümtür- ‘to bring out’ is spelled with y° but so is üç ‘three’. In view of all this, no unvoiced pharyngial fricative can be posited for Old Turkic proper.

2.35. The sibilants

We take Old Turkic in general to have distinguished between two voiceless sibilants, alveolar /s/ and palatal /ʃ/, though not all runiform texts and sources in Uygur writing consistently distinguish between them. Manichæan writing has two quite different characters, but a few Manichæan texts (quoted by Zieme 1969: 37-38) show S where other Turkic sources have Š. This appears to be a phonological or phonetical rather than a graphemic matter, as shown by the fact that /ʃ/ is spelled in regular fashion in the same mss. in Middle Iranian stretches. Zieme
THOMSEN thinks that this might be a dialectal characteristic of these texts. The various runiform characters for front and back /s/ and /š/ also alternate in the different runiform inscriptions, both in that different inscriptions show different distributions and as alternation within the same inscription; e.g. the BQ inscription has much more Š characters than the largely parallel KT inscription, which is two years earlier. This complex matter was dealt with by Thomsen 1896: 38, T. Tekin 1966 and 1968: 61-2 and 93-98, Amanžolov 1970 and Tenišev 1971. S.E. Malov proposed in this connection that /š/ probably existed in the literary language but that the Orkhon Turks actually pronounced both common Turkic phonemes as /s/, and Tekin 1968: 94 agrees with him.140 The inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire and most runiform mss. (notably the Irgb) have no Š letter at all; some runiform mss. use s with a diacritic line above it to represent š2. The suffix -mlš is regularly spelled as -mlš2 in the Orkhon inscriptions, which do have the letter Š (also after stems with back synharmonism); the Uygur runiform ŠU inscription, which does not have Š, does use -mlš with back-harmony stems. The problem posed by such alternation has not been satisfactorily explained as yet.

/ž/, the voiced counterpart of /s/, is solidly attested and well discernible in the writing system; see the next section for /ž/ ~ /š/ alternations.

/š/, the voiced counterpart of the palatal fricative /ʃ/, is found in borrowings, e.g., in ažun ‘existence, life’, užik ‘letter of an alphabet’, kūžil ‘nice’, trižul ‘trident’, arži ‘ṛṣi (a class of beings in Indian religions)’, možag (a Manichaean title), čižu ‘truth’, tathāk ‘thus-being’ or kūži ‘incense’. In case it did exist in genuine Turkic words, then only as an alternant of the unvoiced palatal affricate /ʃ/ (see below). In Suv, we often find ažūn spelled as ašun: This may be an instance of voice confusion in spelling; it may also be, however, that we here have evidence that this foreign sound was replaced by the indigenous /š/. The same can be said e.g. in the case of arži, which is also spelled with Ș a few times in late mss. such as BT III, Shô, Suv and some from the ETŞ (see UW 221).141

The 3rd person imperative suffix -žUn possibly had a voiced palatal fricative [ʒ] or affricate [ʃ] in its onset: It is, in one instance in a runiform ms., spelled with the relevant diacritic on the Z sign and, in one inscriptive case, with the runiform letter for /š/; see section 3.23.

140 Texts reflecting a more spoken language, such that wrote e.g. -sAr for the conditional suffix -sAr or kūrk for kūrk ‘necessary’, show no evidence for /š/ becoming /s/.

141 These instances are less likely to be reminiscences of the Sanskrit form.
2.36. The liquids

The liquids /r/ and the alveolar nasal /n/ are sometimes grouped together as ‘sonants’ because they share certain traits of behaviour; in some cases /z/ also behaves like them. The sonants have certain characteristics in common, which also distinguish them from other consonants: Among other things they can be used as first element in consonant clusters at the ends of syllables; other consonants (e.g. the voiced alveolar) appear with stop allophones when preceded by them.

Sitting astride on the synchrony / diachrony distinction on the one hand and the word formation / morphology distinction on the other is an irregular and badly understood alternation between /r/ and /z/. In morphology we find /z/ in the suffix of the negated aorist, where the positive aorist has /r/: -r (a variant of the suffix appearing after vowels) vs. -mA-z. Other instances of the alternation fall more into the domain of etymology. The cases of +sXz, the privative suffix vs. the formative +sIrA- derived from it, sâmiz ‘corpulent’ vs. sâmri- ‘to be or become corpulent’, sekiz ‘sharp-witted’ vs. sekeri- ‘to jump, hop’, sâz ‘pale’ vs. sarig ‘yellow’ (< *sârî-g) replacing it, yultuz ‘star’ vs. yultrî- ‘to gleam or shimmer’, Ottoman yaldîz vs. Old Turkic yaltrî- ‘to glimmer’, töz ‘root, origin, element’ vs. törö- ‘to come into existence’ and yavîz ‘bad’ vs. yavrdî- ‘to be or become weak’ may all be explained by the fact that the /z/ appears at the end of its stem while /r/ is followed by a vowel; all these instances are discussed in the OTWF. One might want to decide that the /r/ is primary and the /z/ secondary by making the coda position responsible or one could see it the other way around, considering the /r/ to be caused by the presence of a vowel after it. Looking at âsiz ‘woe; alas’ vs. âsirkâ- ‘to regret the loss of someone or something’, kâz ‘notch’ vs. kârt- ‘to notch’, kîz ‘girl’ vs. kûrîn ‘maidservant’ or közsüz ‘eyeless’ vs. kösürkän ‘mole’ one might prefer the first explanation: In all these cases the /z/ is at the end of the stem while the /r/ is not, though there is a great variety in what follows the /r/. The final position of /z/ in küntüz ‘during daytime’ vs. /r/ in the composite suffixes +dXrtIn, +dXrAn and +dXrtI points in the same direction. There is a related alternation z ~ rs in tîrgâk ‘elbow’, presumably from tisz ‘knee’, and borsmok ‘badger’ and borslan (a jingle with arslan), both in the DLT, presumably from boz ‘grey, grey-brown’. Here, again, the /z/s are at the end of the stem while the /rs/s are inside theirs. The same

\[142\] See the discussion in OTWF 88.
explanation could be appropriate for köz ‘eye’ vs. kör- ‘to see’ and kutuอร ‘raving dog etc.’ vs. kutur- ‘to rave’, taking into account the fact that verb stems appear much oftener with suffixes than nominal stems. All this does not help us on in a case like tägzin- ‘revolve, rotate, travel about’ (with derivates and /z/ cognates such as tägzınč, tägznım, tägzig etc.) vs. tägrä ‘surrounding’, tägrilä- ‘to assemble people around something’, tägirmi ‘around’, tägirmän ‘mill’, unless we are ready to make some bold etymological assumptions. The explanation could, however, very well apply to -mAż vs. -r, if we take the suffix to have originally had an additional vowel. This vowel would have dropped in the negative form earlier than in the positive, as stress was on the syllable preceding -mA- in the first case but on the suffix in the second. When it dropped from the positive form as well, the wróci > zści rule would no longer have been operative. Some of the mentioned connections may admittedly be spurious, but our account of the evidence has not aimed at exhaustiveness; there will in any case remain enough evidence for the alternation r ~ z, which got so intertwined with the Altaic question. The OTWF discusses a similar alternation between /l/ and /š/. The stem of kör- might also possibly originally have been *körür-, seeing that the aorist of this verb is körür and not ‘körür’ (as would be expected from simple single-syllable verbs).

143 The aorist suffix has been connected with a Mongolic suffix which does have an additional vowel.

144 Common Turkic /š/ appears as /l/ in cognates in Chuvash-Bolgar and Mongolic.

145 The note to HTs VII 670 derives ötlüm from ötür-, appearing to assume an /l/ ~ /š/ alternation; but no such alternation is attested in Old Turkic. I would consider it more likely for ötlüm to be related indirectly, by coming from an -Xl- derivate of the base.
2.4. Phonotactics and phonetic processes

Phonotactic rules may have been different for genuine Turkic words and for borrowings. bodisav (with variant bodisavt; class of Buddhist deities) was, e.g., probably pronounced with a coda cluster which was not found in Turkic words, and probably mixed front and back vowels. When writing down borrowed words scribes could always to some degree be guided not only by the way Turks pronounced these, but also by how they were spelled in their original languages and especially in transmitting languages; this is true especially for religious texts, and in particular in source languages like Sogdian, for which the same writing systems were used as for Uygur. Still, Turkic phonotactics did interfere, e.g. by putting vowels before /rl/’s which appear at the beginnings of foreign words, or by occasionally breaking up consonant clusters. Concerning borrowings, therefore, we cannot content ourselves with looking at single spelling instances of words, but look at the whole set of variants, to see how pronunciation and spelling might have evolved in the context of the conflicting tendencies of Turkisation on the one hand and learned rendering on the other. To give just one example, the word signifying ‘planet’ spelled as KRX cannot automatically be expected to have been pronounced as ‘grax’ and get transcribed as gr(a)x just because it had an onset cluster in Sanskrit; the Turks might just as well have broken up this onset cluster. Nor should one automatically assign changes in borrowed lexemes to the influence of Turkic: If Sanskrit bodhisattva appears in Uygur also as bodisavt, the loss of the coda vowel should have taken place already in the Aryan dialect which served as source of the borrowing; the metathesis tv > vt might be an internal Turkic matter but could also have existed in an intermediate language through which the word reached Uygur; the shape of a lexeme in the ultimate source language is not really relevant. What interests us primarily in this descriptive work are the synchronic rules which can be extracted from our material: e.g. the fact that all parts of Old Turkic show quite a number of borrowed words with onset /l/ as compared to the scarcity of onset /rl/, even though both are equally barred from original Turkic phonotactics.

2.401. Vowel assimilation by vowels

The central phonotactic phenomenon of Turkic languages is synharmonism, a grammaticalised progressive assimilation functioning on the level of syllables, determining the choice between classes of vowel phonemes and between allophones of consonants; it has been called
vowel harmony because it typically works on the subphonemic level for consonants but on the phonemic level for vowels. The structure of Old Turkic synharmonism has already been referred to in section 2.2 and its functioning at morpheme junctures will be described in section 2.51. It could also have been described among phonotactic phenomena in that it consists of a set of relationships between elements in the sound syntagm constituting the word. It has been often stated that vowel harmony determines the borders of the word; this is true of the phonological word only: The morphological word is often shorter than the phonological, in that clitics are included in synharmonism; the lexical or semantic word is often longer than the phonological, in that lexical units can consist of several morphological words. The identity of Old Turkic sounds is not, however, determined by synharmonism alone.

Backward vowel assimilation can concern lip rounding, raising or fronting. Backward rounding of vowels can be observed occasionally, e.g. in ärtügü < ärtüğü (KP 3,8), tägilök < *tägil-ök ‘blind’ (KPZieme 1), sugun < sığun (TT VII 29), tağisok < tağisok (< tag+sok, BT XIII 46,35), tągünür män in a text in Tibetan script excerpted in Clauson 1962: 99, yertünčü < yertünçü (KP 14,8, 47,6 and 78,3, Buddhat 24 and 42), külgür- < kigür- ‘to introduce’ (see OTWF 750 and 817) or nugošjak in ms. Mz 169 (= T I x 21, published in Sertkaya 1985). In körtgünç < kertgünç (UigSukh 38) and örgür- < er-gür- (documented in OTWF 575, 749 and 755-6) low vowels are rounded. yaratunu uma- in KT E 10 shows that the phenomenon is old.

Backward unrounding is rarer; it happens with the instrumental ending, e.g. in ögrünčülín < ögrünčü+lüg (MatH XX 1r7) or umusgüzín (Suv 19,17 together with inasgüzín) < umug+suz. Accusative forms such as özimin < özüm-in or ögimin < ögüm-in are attested a number of times in DKPAM mss., and cf. yumüş+či < yumuş in BT VII A387. These could, however, be mere spelling peculiarities, as we also find

147 The generally attested derivate from tągil- ‘to be blinded’ is tągl-ök. The additional second vowel is more likely to be secondary (as with the next word mentioned) than to have been retained from the original verb base. Cf. yağilok < yağil- in U II 87,54 and basurok < bas-ur- in ShoAv 317 and BT XIII 39,22, where the old and widely attested variants of ‘error’ and ‘oppressor’ are yağlok and basrok.

148 There appears to be another inscriptionsal instance in 1.4 of part B of the Qara Balgasun inscription (Uygur Steppe Empire). In a footnote to Blatt p.301 Thomsen proposes reading nugošjak, basing his proposal among other things on Radloff 1894: 293. Orkun 1938: 38 followed the Finnish Atlas, which has the impossible n’wg’wr.

149 Cf. +s‘ın in Tuñ 35 in a back-vowel word. On the other hand, +sXz may have been originally unrounded, as shown by the formative +stA- derived from it.
Backward raising influence is found in forms such as ešidtür- (e.g. U I 6,3 in a Christian text), eštil- and eštür- from äšid- ‘to hear’; Brâhmi sources in fact have 13 instances of ešét- / ešit- / ešid- ‘to hear’ (with derivate) vs. only two of äšid-. Thrice el(i)t-, which exists beside ül-, and thrice elig for ‘hand’ in Brâhmi sources (thus making it homophonous with the word for ‘king’) in Brâhmi sources must also have come about through regressive assimilation. The emergence of iki (not eki; see the end of section 2.22) from äki ‘two’ may have the same explanation. 

Backward fronting can only take place when two words become one, as Turkic words by themselves are front or back as wholes. We have this phenomenon in bökün ‘today’ in bökün bar yaran yok ‘here today and gone tomorrow’ (Mait Taf.118r12 = MaitH Y 12b27, colophon re-edited by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133) < bo kün ‘this day’.

Beside synharmonism and the mechanism described in section 2.51 which makes /o ö/ appear in suffixes in which alternating back and front vowels are followed by /k/ unless the vowel preceding the suffix is /u/ or /ü/, Old Turkic in addition had what can be called vowel attraction. By this phenomenon (found in Kirgiz, Kazakh or Turkmen), not only [o] and [ö] but also [e] turn up in non-first syllables of Turkic words: Texts in Indian scripts show that /u/ was often realised as [o] and /ü/ often [ö] and /i/ was sometimes realised as [e] when they were preceded by these same low vowels (see section 2.22), with full assimilation. Even more rarely than the last mentioned assimilation, there sometimes also took place a lowering of vowels even when they were not similar in roundedness: [e] could (rarely) cause [i] to become [ö] and [ö] could (rarely) cause [i] to become [e]. This is neither palatal nor labial harmony but an attraction in the domain of vowel height. In all of these processes it does not matter to which archphoneme a sound belongs; members of /X/ are by no means more prone to assimilation than members of other archphonemes, as maintained by various scholars from Gabain to Doerfer. /o/ and /ö/ did exist in non-first syllables of nominal and verbal stems with /o ö/ in the first syllable, as shown by spellings in alphabets which make the distinction between o and u and between ö and ü visible, namely the Tibetan script and the Tokharian and Khotanese varieties of Brâhmi (the latter in the Turkic-

---

150 The same process is responsible for Yakut ilit ‘hand’ and tiriš- ‘to sweat’ which is related to tür ‘sweat’.

Khotanese hippological glossary below referred to as Hippol). These writing systems represent different traditions, and the texts our statement is based on were written down over several centuries in widely differing places and cultures. This assimilation is found in numerous lexemes and suffixes, often in free alternation with u and ü. We find kolo ‘moment’ (twice in Maue 1996), köööl ‘spirit’ (twice BuddhKat; in TT VIII and Maue 1996 14 times köööl vs. 9 times kööül), kövdöö ‘body’, ordo ‘army camp’, orun ‘place’ (TT VIII L & D and twice in Maue 1996 vs. orun in Maue 1996 nrs. 26 and 27), orto ‘middle’ (TT VIII L, Hippol, Maue 1996 Nr.24 but possibly (o)rtu in TT VIII I23), osog ‘manner’ (Maue 1996 Nr.52), òögöö ‘larynx’ (Hippol), söögöö ‘tree’ (TT VIII K10), toko ‘belt buckle’ (Hippol), tokoz ‘nine’ (BuddhKat, Maue 1996 14 times kööül vs. 9 times kööül), toközöö ‘nine’, toko ‘belt buckle’, tokoz ‘nine’, törö ‘teaching’, yogon ‘thick’, yogto ‘mane’, yolongga ‘clover’, odog ‘awake’ (TT VIII E25 and 41), ogol ‘son’ (thrice in TT VIII D and O).

If we were to propose taking these vowels to be members of archphonemes, we would have to state to which ones they belong: They may be instances of the lowering of /U/ or the rounding of /A/.

Comparative evidence speaks for the latter in the case of Turkish orta, toka, tepe, gövde, boşa-, boya-, Chuvash lar- ‘to sit’ which correspond to Old Turkic orto, toko, tōpō, kövdöö and olor-, but for the former in the case of Turkish ordu, gönül, sögil, dokuz, yoğun, oğul, which correspond to ordo, köööl, söögöö, tokoz, yoğon and ogol; but then one would have to investigate the matter in a way taking other Turkish languages as well into consideration. Classical Mongolian orda and töre are no proof, as second syllable Old Turkic /U/ also has /A/ as Mongolic counterpart: cf. Old Turkic altun ‘gold’ and kööül ‘son-in-law’ vs. Mongolic altun and kūregen. Nor is Yakut evidence

---

152 The source of the unrounding in otra (e.g. DKPAMPb 13 or HTs III 334 and 339) may be the case form in +rA, among the instances of which ‘middle’ fits in very well semantically. otrā with helping vowel (e.g. Abhi A 109a9) is a further development. Pure unrounding, as found in Turkish säksän ‘80’ and toksan ‘90’ < Qarakhanid sāksön, tokson (< earlier sākiz on, tokaz on) does not seem to occur in Old Turkic but is typical for Mongolic (e.g. altun ‘gold’).

153 The editor has a wrong interpretation, as guessed in the EDPT; correct reading in Maue 1983: 64, n.51.

154 By the editor misread as ‘töhö’ and translated as “Hirse”; read correctly by Maue 1983: 59 n.40. The /i/ of tögi ‘crushed millet’ would not have been rounded.
significant, in view of, e.g., the Yakut causative suffix -tAr-
corresponding to Old Turkic -tUr-.

The assimilation of [u] to [o] takes place also in suffixes; we have it in
the following forms: the vowel converb -U appearing with -o l -ə in tol-
o, ör-ə, kőtör-ə and ötər-ə (thus 5 times in Maue 1996, TT VIII and
BuddhKat vs. once ötər); with -gU, the suffix of projection participles,
in öl-gö+sfinťü (Maue 1996 Nr.4); with the formative -(U)j in yogr-ot
'yogurt'; finally, in the aorist suffix -Ur as -o r l -ı̄r in olor-or, kod-or,
odon-or, ökön-ör (vs. -ür in the same environment in közön-ür) and the
very common b(o)lor (41 times in Maue 1996 and TT VIII vs. 6 times
bolur in the same sources and 4 times bolur in BuddhKat). With boș-
in Iğläri boșomişğ / in Maue Nr.27,16, translated by the editor as
"den, dessen […] (pl.) befreit sind", the matter is more complicated.155

We find the assimilation to /o] ö/ also within the archphoneme /X/ in
yör-üg (Maue 1996 Nr.14 and 26) with the formative -(X)g, in kőtör-
thrice in Maue 1996 with the passive formative -XI-, in kötör-öp in
Maue 1996 Nr.30 with the converb suffix -(X)p, in nom+og and
yörög+ög in the accusative suffix in Maue 1996 Nr.28, in osog+log
'like, in the manner of', tör+lōg], nom+log and öz+lōg with the suffix
+lxg, in ögrönčölg (TT VIII A6) with the suffix -(X)nc in
kögöl+önöç+lärön / (TT VIII E47) with a possessive suffix, etc. The
last-mentioned instance shows that /A/ is not rounded. Sometimes
assimilation does not take place even with /U/ and /XI/, e.g. in köl-ük
'vehicle' and törvälg (both Maue 1996 Nr.51), tözc+üg and bol+zun (both
Maue 1996 Nr.33; the latter also 7 times in Maue Nr.79 and in TT VIII
G vs. twice pol-son in TT VIII E) or in taloy+nug, ög+dən, bogunlug156
and adrok+suz (all four Maue 1996 Nr.21). The mss. Maue 1996 Nr.3
(oğ+r-sär and atöc+üg vs. thrice bol-or), 29 (örkün 'throne', yör-üg,
twice olur- 'to sit', twice nom+ug) and 44 (törünö, tözüö, twice törü,

155 Old Turkic has a transitive denominal formative +A- and an intransitive +U-.
As discussed in OTWF 477-8, Qarahakaništ bošu- or bošo- is both tr. and intr., while only tr.
bošu- or bošo- was hitherto documented in Uygur, until Maue proposed his translation.
This would accord with our expectations, as it would be normal for +U- to be realised
as [o], were it not that the context of this instance is so fragmentary and that no other
intr. bošu- l bošo- seems to have turned up in Uygur. For /l/ to become /l/ seems
unusual for Old Turkic as a whole, however, and for the +A- formation in particular, as
we find unrounded ota-, koru-, tola-, oça-, köylà- and orna-. So word formation
will have to stay with its irregular tr. +U- as far as this verb is concerned, and can
assume an intr. +U- beside it, which lowered its vowel in this Brahmi passage.

156 Wrongly spelled togunlugl, which gives no sense. bog-un 'articulation in a person’s
limbs or in the trunk or stalk of a plant' – discussed in OTWF 305 – is no doubt an -Xn
derivative from bog- ‘to strangle'.
twice *nom+ug*) appear to have /ʊ/ after /o/ rather consistently; 23/12 has *ölug, *öldün, bölük and *özlüg in one sentence vs. numerous instances of *o – *o elsewhere in the text.

In a few cases, the lowering of /U/ and /X/ takes place also when the preceding syllable has /e/.\(^\text{157}\) It is noteworthy (and difficult to explain if not coincidental) that /a/ does not cause such lowering. As these environments are thus limited to the presence of low vowels in the preceding syllable, the presence of the phonemes /o ö/ in non-first syllables would not follow from these instances. Old Turkic non-first syllables thus had /o ö/ as phonemes (e.g. in *idok ‘sacred’), and in addition [o] and [ö] as allophones when preceded by these same phonemes.\(^\text{158}\)

### 2.402. Vowel assimilation by consonants

In contiguity with /g r l/, what we would expect to be /i/ is quite often spelled with *alef (e.g. *amal ‘spiritual peace’, *tat-ag ‘taste’, *bar-amlg ‘well to do’, *yaran ‘tomorrow’ or *lag for +/Xg), reflecting a real lowering of the vowel in these surroundings. This is not to be confused with the general spelling of [i] with *alef which we find quite often though irregularly in pre-classical texts. We know about this lowering primarily from evidence in Indic scripts, the texts which use these generally not being particularly early. In BuddhKat, e.g., we find /i/ realised as [a] (or at least psychologically assigned to the /a/ and not the /i/ phoneme) when adjacent to /g/ in *aha-g (< *api-g), *ara-g ‘clean’ (beside *ari-g), *arag ‘wood (small forest)’ < *arïg, *at+lag (beside *at+çg) ‘rider’, *didim+lag ‘wearing a diadem’,\(^\text{159}\) *ayag ‘bad’ < *ayïg, *kaç-ag ‘point of contact with the physical world’ and *sarsag ‘repulsive’.\(^\text{160}\)

157 E.g. *ergö özi (Maue 1996 Nr.50) < *et-gü özi, en`golog`a (TT VIII A36), *kergonel`g (TT VIII A33) < *kergonel`g or *yertöncö ‘world’ (TT VIII N4) < *yertöncö < *yertöncü.

158 This was still doubted in Gabain 1974 § 23 and Zieme 1969: 43. As evidence against the presence of /o ö/ in non-first syllables, Zieme mentions the adverb *küntämäk ‘daily’, analysing it as ‘*kün+täm äk with the particle *Ok. I would rather analyse this word as *kün+tä (y)mä (ö)k with two particles, and the vowel of *Ok elided; see section 3.342 for mA as variant of *mä. The derivational suffix +dAm forms nominal denoting similarity to the base noun, a meaning which does not suit this word. Cf. *incäk ‘thus’ < *in+çä (ö)k.

159 See the section 2.52 for the possibility that this be read with an [i] in the second syllable and for the harmony rules for suffixation in borrowings in general.

160 I am only giving those instances where the reading as *a is unequivocal; some further spellings might be considered as well.
Brāhmī writing has such variants especially in the ms. TT VIII 1.161 Evidence for this phonetic phenomenon in Semitic scripts is by no means limited to Manichæan or pre-classical texts, as sometimes thought; in TT X, e.g., we have tap-ag ‘service’ and the accusatives sav+ag ‘word’, burxan+ag and arxant+ag, in KP kar-am, as-ag ‘benefit’ and tat-agług ‘tasty’ (beside u-ma-dam ‘I was unable’, which has none of the lowering consonants). In the runiform ms. Blatt 14 we read taš+ag alsar ‘if one takes the stone (acc.)’.162 The phenomenon is documented even earlier than Orkhon Turkic: Among the Turkic terms appearing in Bactrian as edited in Sims Williams 2000 we have tap-ag+lïg ‘revered’ in texts dated to the years 640, 679 and 682; the Greek spelling used for Bactrian clearly distinguishes between a and i. The spelling of the name + title tapglg saµm in Mahrnâmag (= Müller, Doppelblatt) 56 is also better interpreted in this way.163

Occasionally we find what looks like the opposite process, low vowels getting raised beside /r/ or /l/: arïla- < ara+la- ‘to intercede’, arï < ara+ë ‘intercessor’, övkïla- < övkä+lä- ‘to be furious’, buñïçïla / buñïçïlayu ‘like a cloud’, ançïlayu and munçïlayu, bizïçïlayu, sïniçïlayu and sizïçïlayu all < +çA+AyU. This must be related to the fact that /r/ have the potential for syllabicity.164 However, raising of middle vowels takes place also when +dA is repeatedly added to personal pronouns in sin+di+dä and min+di+dä. So this might be part of a more general process, which led to the general middle vowel raising of Modern Uygur. In RH08 and 11 (SammlUigKontr 2) nâ+çëä appears as niçä.

The labial consonants round vowels in some cases in Orkhon Turkic, more so in Uygur and even more often in Qarakhanid. amïl ‘gentle(ness), (marked by) spiritual peace’, e.g., always appears as amul in the DLT and the QB and occasionally in Manichæan and Buddhist

161 It has the accusatives aš+ag ‘food’ (2 and 8) and turmak+ag ‘remanence’ (22), the deverbal formative ak-ag ‘flow’ (7) and aba-g ‘protected’ (21), the +lxg derives tuprak+lag ‘having earth’ (18) and yag+lag ‘oily’ (19) and the adjective agar ‘heavy’ (12) < agîr. Also, however, the verb form ašn-ap (17) ‘hanging (a necklace) on oneself’ which has no consonant causing such a shift and suggests the ms. must have been written by someone within the pre-classical spelling tradition.

162 And not tâš, because the second vowel of the first word is implicit; it has to be [a] and not [i] because all other [i]s of this text are spelled out explicitly.

163 HTs VII 2051 should, however, be read as ayya tapîglik tavar iddîmîn ‘We have sent a little present for reverence’; not tapîgli ‘and as read by the editor.

164 Analogy from the common munçïlayu could be the reason for the rounding of the vowel also with unrounded bases.
slopes.\(^{165}\) The second syllable of *yagmur* ‘rain’, must be such an instance, as *almir* and other nouns show that they are derived with a suffix of the shape *-mXr* (OTWF § 3.326). The process happens to second-syllable [i, i] also in mss. written in the Sogdian script, e.g. in *avuč < avič*, the name of a hell, *amul* or *tap-ug* ‘service’, *tapug* as well as *tapugči* and *tapugsak* appear in the DLT as well, and hundreds of times in the QB. Elsewhere we find this process sporadically, e.g. in *kamuš* ‘reed’ in the IrqB, in *sāv-ūg* as documented in OTWF 201-2\(^{166}\) or in *tamdul-* ‘to get ignited’ < *tamūl-* in Suv., BT XIII 39 and ETŞ. In *köpik* (IrqB XX and Heilk II 1,103) < *köpik* ‘froth’ and *kōpīr-* < *köpir-* ‘to froth’ (documented in OTWF 239-40) the rounding of the second syllable is caused more by the /p/ than by the first vowel. The rounding in the DLT’s *yaprul-* could either come from the /p/ or be a reflex of the syncopated /U/. The DLT’s *tap-uz*, *tapuzgu* and *tapuzguk* ‘riddle’, *arvuš*, and *kap-uš* in QB 6482 all get their /u/ from the labial consonant. The rounding in the last syllable of borrowed *karmaput < Skt. karmapatha* and *čaxkapat < Manichean Sogdian cxis’pō* took place within Old Turkic. Uygur *tâmir* ‘iron’ appears as *tāmūr* in MaitH XXV 2v11 or BT XIII 4,31; *Tāmūr* is a common proper name in late documents and was the base of Chinggis Khan’s name *Temūjin*. The DLT also writes *tāmūr* and has *äm-üz* ‘to breastfeed’ and *tamūz* ‘to drip’ where Uygur has *ämiz* and *tamiz*. *tumlug* and *tumlïg* ‘cold’ are equally well attested from the earliest Uygur on but *tumlï-g* must clearly be the source. The name of the mythical mountain Sumeru is generally spelled as *SWMYR* in Uygur, which we transcribe as *sumer*. The rounded variant *SWMWR* in BT VIII can be read either as *sumer* or *sumur*. While rounding by labial consonants is thus a wide-spread phenomenon both in Turkic and borrowed stems and in derivational affixes, rounding in inflexional verbal suffixes including diathesis morphemes appears to be a dialect characteristic. We find *tilädüzüm* *istädüzüm* ‘we wanted and searched’ in HamTouHou 18,7, in a ms. written in Khotan; *+UmUz* and *-dUmUz* instead of normal *+(X)mXz* and *-dXmXz* is attested also in one ms. of the (Manichean) Xw. In fragments written in Sogdian script, whose dialect is aberrant also in other respects, we have *tak+umuz* (251) instead of *takîmez* and, with the preterit form which has the same suffixes, *si-dumuz* (256) and *bačama-dumuz* (258);\(^{166}\)

\(^{165}\) *amal*, another Uygur variant, is caused by the process described above, whereby /u/ is lowered to /a/ through the contiguity of /l/.

\(^{166}\) Sims-Williams 2000 reads the name of a Khaladj queen said to be a Turkic lady in a document from the year 711 as *Bilgä Sävüg*; the ms. has *bilgä savoh*, concerning the last syllable, note that the script does not distinguish between different rounded vowels.
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**kurtgardum** (600) ‘I saved’ instead of what is usually -dXm, tapuntïlar (2) with the reflexive suffix which otherwise has the shape -(X)n- and the converb form ámbânïp (240) which otherwise ends in -(X)p. Such rounding is characteristic also for early Anatolian Turkish (as is the +nUŋ genitive mentioned in section 3.124).

We get first syllable rounding in bin- (Orkhon Turkic) ‘to mount, to ride’ > mîn- (IrqB) > mûn- (Qarakhanid and other Uygur sources) and, as a prehistorical process, in bût- ‘to be completed’ < *bit- (still attested in Turkish) and mUÈ, the question particle, < *mîtl|a|d|a, a variant of mun+ta+da as well as mîn+ca and mîn+ti|n (section 3.132) show that the demonstrative stem bu+ might originally have had the shape bi+ (unless these are two different stems). The first vowel of bô|d|î- ‘to dance’ may have been rounded secondarily, to judge by Middle Turkic evidence mentioned in OTWF 184 and by some modern forms. The DLT has mû|j|l|ä- < mû|j|l|ä- bu|g|ak ‘segment’ (a.o. in bulu|ş|u|z bu|g|ak|s|î|z, TT VI 427) presumably comes from biç- ‘to cut’. bu|f|ît ‘cloud’ comes from *bô|f|î|t, as made likely by Yakut and Chuvash cognates; bürgâ ‘flea’ is related to Ottoman pi|r|e. mûr|è ‘pepper’ ultimately comes from Skt. marica ‘pepper’; it lost its coda vowel in Middle Indic, its first vowel was then raised to i by an Iranian intermediary and finally rounded in Uygur.

In the following examples vowel rounding takes place before the labial consonant: sipir- ‘to sweep’ (Manichaean) > sü|p|îr- (DLT etc.) can be compared to Mongolian sî|ûr-, which shows rounding only in the second syllable. In sî|v|r|e ‘pointed’ (Uygur and Qarakhanid), the rounding took place before our earliest texts; sîvri is, however, attested in Western Oguz. Cf. further the well-attested tîm|ä- with derivate < tîm|ä- ‘to prepare’, cîm|gân (BT III and DLT) < cîm+gân ‘meadow’, to|mûr- ‘to bleed’ < *tâm-ur- and Uygur (also Manichaean) yum|sâk ‘soft’ < Orkhon Turkic yîm|sâk. Evidence for the hypothesis that suv ‘water’ comes from *sîv is given in OTWF 177. Low vowels are affected in this way in kôvšâk ‘pliant, limp’ (OTWF 236-7) < kâv|s|â-, köv|r|û ‘weak’ in BT XIII 1,7 (convincingly shown to come from *kâv-|û-), öv|g|â < ev- ‘to hurry’ in ZiemeSklav I 4 and tôvšâ- < tâv|s|â- in the DLT. The vowel of cóm- ‘to submerge’ may also be secondary in view

---

167 This is the only shape of the particle attested in Early Ottoman, whereas Old Turkic i|Ü| otherwise corresponds to i|U| in Early Ottoman as well. Vowel rounding due to labial consonants is much weaker in Western Oguz than elsewhere.

168 Sims Williams 2000 proposed an Iranian etymology for this word, linking it to Avestan su|f|r|â- and its cognates. This proposal seems to be compatible with the Turkic facts only if the rounding is secondary in the Iranian data as well.
of čamgak ‘a big cooking pot’ (BT XIII 5.77 and elsewhere). tōpō ‘hill’ presumably comes from *tāpā, attested in the whole of Öguz Turkic since early Ottoman. The possibility cannot be wholly dismissed that tāpā, bit-, mI, sivri, Azeri birä or Middle Turkic (Codex Comanicus and Muqaddimatu ‘l-Adab) beyi- ‘to dance’, none of which are attested in Old Turkic, could also be the result of an unrounding process; this could come from the fact that /ü ö/ do not exist in the Iranian languages with which the users of these variants were in contact. Such an explanation would not, however, cover instances such as bulit, suv and kamsü, and if /p v m/ caused rounding in back vowels there is no reason why they should not have rounded front vowels as well. There are enough front words, moreover, where the rounding takes place in the course of the development of Old Turkic (e.g. čümğän); the above list is by no means complete.

The verb ‘to be born’ has the shape tog- ten times in the (older) BuddhKat but the shape tug- more than a dozen times in the (later) texts in Brāhmi writing. I would take the former to be the older form and the latter to be due to the labial raising influence of /lgl/.

Palatal consonants can front the vowel following them: We have fronting after the consonant cluster [ñθ] in koñilärkā in a runiform ms. (Miran c 5) and in īnañlări in Brāhmi script, in Maue 1996 Nr.29 B6 (spelled with ī). In Uygur script such phenomena could be detected only if a velar consonant follows further on in the word. The /lgl/ was probably the reason for the fronting of the vowels in an Uygur variant of the adverb and conjunction yana to yänä, yenä, ynä ‘again; moreover’, which comes from Orkhon Turkic yana. Among the Brāhmi instances, eight are spelled as yenä, yinä or ynä; the TT VIII instance spelled as yňā was by Clauson read with a back vowel, but the ñ may have been meant to indicate that the vowel was front. In Semitic writing systems, the question of whether the synharmonism of this word was back or front can be determined if it is followed by the particle Ok, as it sometimes is. In Uygur we find yinä òk e.g. in TT X 17 and 358 and DKPAMPb 275 but yana ok e.g. in BT XIII 4.29 or in

---

169 It may happen, inversely, that rounded vowels change /y/ to /m/: kōmildürük ‘breast strap of a saddle’ presumably comes from kōŋđ; Turkish has further examples for this phenomenon.

170 Originally the vowel converb of yan- ‘to return’. Clauson (EDPT) ascribed the change to the influence of the particle ymä, which does indeed show some similarity to yana in both shape and meaning.

171 Cf. sön-ök spelled as söñok in TT VIII M 21.
In QB 643, 734, 3896, 3960, 4956, 5011, 6180 and 6343 the mss. fluctuate between yana ok and yänä ök with some preponderance of the former in the older mss. B and C; in 3889 Arat writes yana ok against all three of them. The occurrences in DLT fols. 455 and 519 can be read either as yana or yänä in spite of the coda alif. The Middle Turkic and modern Turkic languages as listed in EDPT show both variants.

The change of ayïn- ‘to fear’ to äyin- documented in OTWF 591 may be due either to the presence of the sound sequence /yï/ or to the existence of äymän-, a verb with a meaning similar to ayïn- but hardly related to it etymologically; or it may have been caused both by the phonetic context and by the analogy. Where no /i/ is involved, back/front fluctuation is not unheard of in Old Turkic, but is certainly rare. One example is tiši sadrak ‘gappy toothed’ in SP 21, whereas ‘gappy’ normally is sädräk. This is not a scribe’s error, as we also have tröksüz sadraksiz tiš in MaitGeng 5 b 13 and the same phrase with sädräksiz in 11 b 18 of that same text section.

In borrowings, the presence of /k/ tends to front surrounding vowels. This phenomenon (dealt with in Erdal 2002: 8-13) is relevant not only for comparing shapes which the lexemes have in the different languages but also for their shape within Uygur, as such words tend to fluctuate between front and back variants and sometimes to show a harmony discrepancy between the different syllables of the stem and between stems and suffixes. Such a case is the term probably pronounced as šlok or šlök (or šulok, šülök etc.), which signifies ‘stanza, verse’. Other such cases are užık / užık / užık ‘letter, character’ and čadık / čadık ‘story about a previous life of Buddha’ with coda /k/, kümüt / kumut ‘lotus’ with onset /k/, šaki / šaki ‘name of an Indian family’ with medial /k/. That front spelling of /k/ does not necessarily determine the harmony class is proven by n’gws’kɔl’rı nagošaklar ‘lay believers’ in the runiform ms. TM 332 (KöktüTurf p.1047), which has front k̄ but back-harmony letters for the plural suffix. When the last stem syllable was front, harmony fluctuation in suffixes was still possible, as some scribes might treat the stem as foreign by consistently giving it back-harmony suffixation while some might adapt harmony to the stem.

---

173 op- ‘to gulp down’ and öp- ‘to kiss, to sip a liquid’ also look like variants and may even have been confused by speakers, but their similarity must be due to sound symbolism.
2.403. Syncopation and stress

Medial vowels of stems outside the first syllable are often syncopated; here are a few among the innumerable examples: agz+amïz+da < agïz+ (Wettkampf 8 and 21), älg+in (accusative, 3rd pers. possessive) < älig ‘hand’ (Wettkampf 87), ogl+um > ogl+um, bogz+i, agz+i and kögl+i (TT VIII I 1, 2 and 4 respectively), orn+ïnta (TT X 335), adïr > adr-il- and adïr-iþ (M III nr.33, 45,2a), tamït-il- > tamdul-, äšïd-il- and äšïd-üþ- > ešïl-, ešïr-, kat-il-ïþ- > katïš-, ‘igïd-ïþ- > igïš or *üvir-ïþ- > üvïš. kïkïra aïlkïra < alakïr-a (MaitH XXV 2v12) ‘shouting’ is an instance of /a/, a low vowel, getting syncopated. Outside the second syllable we have e.g. yöläšr-üug < yöläš ür-; As shown by the petrified converb yagru (not yaguru, which would, in Orkhon Turkic spelling, have to be spelled with explicit vowel in the second syllable) < *yagu-r- of Orkhon Turkic, the coda vowel of stems could also get dropped if it got into medial position; the Orkhon inscriptions also have yetrü < *yet-üþ-ü. This should mean that the first and the last syllable of a word had some prominence over the others, or that medial vowels were not stressed. The unsyncopated forms often exist beside the syncopated ones, but this does not necessarily mean that usage fluctuated: It could also be that full forms persist for the consistent spelling of lexical and morphological units without consideration of the actual phonetic realization. The deletion of suffix-onset vowels not only after vowels but also after /l/ is discussed in the next section. We just mentioned yöläšr-üug < yöläšür-. Derivational suffixes are syncopated also in tuytrum < tuy-tur-, basrok < bas-ur-ok, äšïrïglï (BT V 11,204) and ešïrïðš- (TT II,1 56) < äšïd-Ur- and iš kïdïg-üþ- (TT I 119) < iš kïdïg ‘business’. tark- (Buddhist MaitH XV 10v22, Manichaean BT V 494) < tar-ik-, körk- < körï-k- and balk- < balïk- are all formed with the formative -(X)k-. Compound voice suffixes such as -(X)Xz-, -(X)n-, -(X)l- or +(X)Ar- came about through syncopation of the vowel of their first elements, -(X)t-, -(X)l- and -(X)k-.

tUr-U° becomes -trU° in berïräldr < ber-ür-ür-lär (TT VI, main ms. against the edition) and kaiyntrup < kayîn-tur- (TT VIII M 30, Brâhmi) and in fact already in Orkhon Turkic in the petrified converb yantru < yan-tur-u (KT N11). These are evidence for the tendency of the phoneme sequence /tur/ to get pronounced as [tru], äšïrïglï, ešïrïðš- and tuytrum, which we just quoted, also show /tr/ starting a syllable. In an identical process, the suffix +dUrXk gets pronounced as +drUk or +trUk in sakaldruk ‘throat strap on a headstall’ and kömïldrïx ‘breast strap’ in Khot 21 and boyontrok in TT VIII A. I do not recall having seen any clusters of three consonants beside instances of °Ctr° just
quoted; in all other cases syncopation takes place only when clusters of two consonants result from them.

The fact that syncopation is outright rare in inflectional suffixes does not necessarily mean that all inflectional suffixes must have been stressed: This could merely reflect the greater need for active morphemes to stay visibly recognizable in writing and audibly so in pronunciation than for what was or had become a syllable in a lexeme. Syncopation does take place under lexicalisation, as happened with tolп `completely', which comes from the converb form tol-up (in M III nr.4 r11 still attested in this shape although already lexicalised). One would, on the other hand, assume that Old Turkic stress was not much different from that of modern languages: default stress on the word’s last syllable, first syllable stress with the expressive adjective reduplication and with the pronominal stem ka+, pre-stressed verbal negation suffix -mA- and so forth. Adverbs could also have had first syllable stress; under this heading, the instrumental and equative suffixes, which were mainly in adverbial use, could have been unstressed. In BuddhKat 5 we find that the instrumental form of (kii) kiiğ ‘magical appearance by metamorphosis’ syncopates the second vowel to give kiiğin; this could mean that instrumental forms stressed the first syllable (cf. Turkish án+szm ‘suddenly’).

The +lA- derivate from ogrii is generally spelled as ogurla- in Uygur; in BuddhKat 11, which is written in Tibetan script, it is spelled as ogrla-, however, and Kiișgarî (fols. 152 and 159) states that the “common people” use this pronunciation (which he doesn’t approve of). It appears that the coda vowel of the base was first syncopated, and that the cluster was then broken apart under the influence of rounding. As a rule, however, rounding assimilation appears as descriptively preceding syncopation: The rounded second vowel of akruiš (documented in the UW entry), e.g., comes from the dropped second vowel of *akur-, the base of ak(u)ru etc.; šiişrun- in BT XIII 12 comes from šiiş-ur-un-, with the syncopated syllable contributing the rounding. The DLT’s savr-uk- has its rounded vowel from the second, syncopated syllable of savur-. This practice changed in some cases: *oğir-inč > oğr-inč only in M II 10,7, taken to be an early text for independent reasons; all other texts have oğrınč. In ötlûm, shown to come from ötlï- in OTWF 293, syncopation must also have preceded the rounding effect. ört-it- ‘to arouse’ sometimes appears as ört-; when it does, we find örtülm in U II 85,26 and örtüp in ET Ş 10,33 but the plural imperative örtîn in BT III 1105 (all three texts are late).
Coda /X/ appears to have gotten dropped prehistorically (as stated several times by Gerhard Doerfer), also with a number of verb stems.\textsuperscript{174} There are, e.g., no suffixes ending with /X/ though there are many suffixes ending with /A/, /I/ or /U/. The noun bod ‘tribe’ may have dropped a coda /U/, if bodun ‘people’ is formed with the collective suffix +(A)n. The vowel could have been retained in the Mongolian cognate boda, Mongolian /A/ corresponding to Turkic /U/ (whereas Mongolian /U/ corresponds to Turkic /X/).

2.404. Consonant distribution
Old Turkic had no limitation at all on phonemes which could appear at the end of syllables and words (as against Mandarin Chinese, e.g., which allows only vowels, n, r and ñ). Nor is there any indication that consonants were devoiced in coda position, the only exception being -mAs, the Qarakhanid variant of -mAz. We also have yanmas yer ‘the place of no return’ in M III nr.16 v 3.\textsuperscript{175} -mAs may therefore have been a dialect variant of the negative aorist suffix.

The only voiced consonant phonemes regularly appearing in the word onset in genuine Turkic words are /b/ and /y/. In addition, there are two or three words starting with nasals: /n/ in nā ‘what’ together with its numerous case forms which sometimes deserve their own dictionary entries, and in nāñ ‘thing; (not) at all’ (possibly also coming from nā); /m/ in mU (the clitic particle for yes/no questions). Furthermore, b consistently becomes m in post-inscriptional Old Turkic (including runiform mss., where we find mončuk ‘bead’) when the following consonant is a nasal, e.g. in big > mī ‘thousand’. The process leading to this sound change is just at its beginning in the language of the runiform inscriptions, where bán ‘I’ > män when placed after verb forms. In this position one could argue, however, that the pronoun was on its way to becoming a suffix or at least a clitic; that b / m was not, in other

\textsuperscript{174} bar- ‘to go’ (because its preterite form is spelled with D and not T in the inscriptions and because of its aorist vowel), kör- ‘to see’ (aorist vowel /ul/ and because of the /l/ in spite of the relationship with kōz ‘eye’), kil- ‘to do’ (because of kili-k ‘character, behaviour’ instead of the expected ‘kīl-ak’ and the aorist kīl trà in the early M I 8,9, normally replaced by kīl ur), sig- ‘to get imbibed etc.’ (because of the causative sing- ‘to swallow, digest’ instead of the expected ‘siy-ur’), yay- ‘to shake, upset, put into disarray’ (because of an attested variant yayi- and a derivate yayik-k) and ay- ‘to say’ (because of the aorist form ayar < *ayi-yar), kiyi- ‘to hew, fell’ and *sezii- ‘to have a suspicion or hunch’ also become kiy- and sez- starting with Qarakhanid, and note kiyik-k ‘something cut obliquely’ and sezik-k ‘doubt’ with the suffix -(O)k.

\textsuperscript{175} This is not an instance of voice confusion, as this is an archaic text lacking this phenomenon; nor does Qarakhanid have voice confusion.
words, in truly onset position. Although #m° < #b° is attested only in Uygur, the process clearly took place when /ñ/ had not yet become /y/.

Otherwise words with /ñ/ in the second syllable, such as meyi ‘brain’ < *bëñi, would not have been involved (see the end of section 2.33).

Since there was no phonemic voice opposition in the onset, the actual pronunciation of onset stops may actually have varied freely; i.e. onset /t/ may, on occasion have been pronounced quite softly or onset /b/ may have lost its voice, making them sound more like /d/ and /p/ respectively. When we find that Castren in the middle of the 19th century noted a number of Karagass (= Tofa) words with /d/ in the onset which all have onset /d/ in Turkmen as well, we can well conclude that Proto-Turkic too allowed these sound to appear in these words. They could possibly have had a voiced (or lenis etc.) onset also in some variants of Old Turkic, e.g. in Orkhon Turkic. Copies from foreign sources such as darni ‘dhäran’, dyan ‘meditation’ or dentar ‘elect’ were spelled with onset D, presumably pronounced as [d]. The spelling tarni which we find in AlttüSogd 251 no doubt reflects this same pronunciation, the T here aiming to exclude the pronunciation [t].

The only voiceless consonant phonemes which did not appear in onset position in Turkic words are /p/ and /š/. This is the situation in runiform sources and in the Uygur-Khotanese word list (where Khotanese terms do appear with onset p). Nothing can actually be said concerning onset /p/ in texts in Uygur and Sogdian writing, as b and p are there expressed by the same letter. In sources in Manichæan writing the onset /p/ of borrowed elements is retained: Zieme 1969: 59 has them listed. A fluctuation bušï (4 times in M III Nrs. 11 and 12) vs. pušï (5 times in Xw) for Chinese pu shi ‘alms’ may either be a sign of adaptation to the Uygur distribution of labials (seeing that this was a term in common use among all Uygur societies) or reflect uncertainty concerning the pronunciation of Chinese /p/ (now spelled as b in pinyin and distinct

---

176 Another possibility is that onset *#m° prehistorically became #b° except where it was protected by a following nasal. It is, at present, difficult to chose between these logically equivalent possibilities.

177 de- ‘to say’ is widespread even among Turkic languages which otherwise do not have onset /d/, including Old Turkic texts not showing voice confusion (e.g. twice in the fragments in Sogdian script); the reason may have been clitic-like distribution, this verb being exclusively used after quoted strings.


179 baškok (no doubt to be interpreted as bašgok; the text has numerous confusions among velars) has nothing to do with pašik ‘hymn’, as stated there; see OTWF 158-9.
from p, the latter spelled as $p^*$ in the Wade-Giles system). It is worth mentioning that sources in Manichaean writing show a small number of onset ps also in original Turkic words: The Pothi Book (which is relatively late as Manichaean texts go) has the greatest number, with pat-il- `to get submerged’, pîsr-un- `to assimilate’, pîk-iün- `to recognize’, püür-ür- (thrice) `to finish’, pag `bond’ and pûkîr `copper’. We also have par-, `to go’ in Xw, p(ä)k-¸ `strong(ly)’ in M III Nr.5 r 8, pârkä- `whip’ and the problematic perkäsä- in M II 139. No lexically significant opposition b : p becomes apparent here; these rather seem to be accidental fluctuations. Sources in Tibetan writing excerpted in Clauson, 1962: 98 spell the words bars (which could be a borrowing), baglïg and bašlagïnï with p, but in (the early) BuddhKat there is no onset p in Turkic words (though there are numerous instances of paramid < þârami! `excellence’ and burxan spelled with p). In Brâhmî sources there is a clear preference for p in the word onset. The prevalence of p in the onset of Turkic words in later texts as against its great rarity in early texts might be due to the influence of the Uygur script on the spelling: The Uygur letter transcribed as b is in fact a Semitic þ. That any phonetic significance should be ascribed to this spelling is not very likely; runiform writing exclusively uses b in this position. The absence of Proto-Turkic onset */p/* has been accounted for by the hypothesis that it changed to */h/- (which was then also dropped from most of the Turkic languages but
not, e.g., Khaladj). This idea, propounded by Poppe, Doerfer and perhaps others, is based on evidence from other Altaic languages (in particular the correspondence with Tunguz). At any rate it explains why $h$ is found only at the beginning of words. One voiced consonant phone which is used in the word onset is [b]; for the sake of rule simplicity, one could consider assigning this to the phoneme /p/ as far as Old Turkic is concerned: It is spelled with $p$ in the Uygur – though not in the Manichaean and runiform – scripts and sometimes also in Brâhmî. /b/ does not appear as [b] even after /l n/, so that there would be no overlapping of allophones. Each row in the table of consonants would, in onset position, be represented by the column most to the left, then, if occupied at all. Through the influx of foreign words, there also emerged a stop : fricative opposition in the onset, when words such as *vačiṁr ‘diamond’, viñay ‘the rules of discipline’ or višay ‘the scope or reach of the sense organs’ were introduced.

The original absence of /s/ in onset position can be explained through the hypothesis that it comes either from a Proto-Turkic palatal lateral (*$/š$/) or from the cluster *$/l$/ did not appear in the word onset either. Regressive assimilation is a secondary source for $s$: Words such as *sāš- ‘to disentangle’, *siš ‘skewer’ and *saš- ‘to be perplexed, confused’ sometimes alter their /s/ to /š/ under influence of the second sibilant; we have šaš-ok, šašurmadin and šašutsuz attested. The sibilants of šašmaksiz (BT XIII 12,38) and šašimsiz (ETŞ 11,146) on the one hand and sašimsiz (BT XIII 60,1 and ETŞ 9,31) on the other are all supported by rote-rhyme (which has quite strict rules), showing that the speaker could freely choose between the variant with /s/ and the one with /š/ under poetic license. The appearance of šišram- < šišran-discussed in OTWF 614 is also related to rote-rhyme. šičgan in Maue 1996 Nr.36 (Brâhmî script; meaning supported by a Tibetan parallel) < šičgan ‘mouse’ is a similar case of assimilation. Regressive assimilation of /s/ to /š/ is not limited to onset position, as shown by küşiš < küşiš ‘wish’ in TT IX 116 (in Manichaean script, where the two letters have a quite different shape).

183 This distribution does not really need an explanation, seeing that it is relatively common among the world’s languages. Practically all of the instances of Tunguz $f$ adduced for such comparisons appear before a labial vowel, so that /uf/ may actually have been the original sound and its labialisation in Tunguz secondary. 184 Cf. Volga Bolgarian baš for Common Turkic baš ‘head’ (Erdal 1993: 107-9 and 122 and T.Tekin 1997), Mongolian eligen for Common Turkic ušgak ‘donkey’ (Khaladj ušgä) and so forth. Classical Mongolian [š] is an allophone of /s/; it had no phoneme /š/ and all Mongolic cognates of Turkic /š/ involve an /l/.
There seems to have been no problem to introduce onset /š/ with borrowings, in view of the appearance of the title šad already in the runiform inscriptions and the widespread use of šimnu / šæmnu to refer to the ,devil‘ (also among Buddhists; there = māra). Cf. also the term šik for a measure of capacity, borrowed from Chinese. Note, though, that šad appears as šad in Taryat N4 (twice) and Tes W6, two runiform inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire. šato ,ladder‘ is also a borrowing and was, in any case, adapted to Turkic in the form of č(ə)jo in an early text (M I Nr.1 III v 8); the Turkic-Khotanese hippological glossary has it with this meaning and o in the second syllable. If we do find šado itself well attested in classical and later texts (including Qarakhanīd), the reason may be that the Turks subsequently got used to having š in onset position. The replacement of an onset foreign sibilant by /š/ appears to have been an areal phenomenon: čixšaput / čaxšapat (etc.) ‘commandment‘ is not a direct loan from Skt. šikšāpada but comes over Sogdian čnš‘pø. The history of ši: ‘moist(ure)‘ (found e.g. in BuddhKat 4) may have been a bit more complicated.¹⁸⁵

Onset č and š can alternate also in onomatopoeics: čogurt (ETŚ 8,13) alternates with şogurt (BT III 233-4, read as sogurt by the editor), čagila- appears as jagila- and şagila- in the DLT. The opposite process takes place after consonants: The DLT replaces š by č when they get into syllable onset position after consonants, in kik-š-ür- > kıkćur-, yap-š-ur- > yapçur- and tap-š-ur- > tapçur-. kökšin ‘greenish, bluish‘ becomes kıkčın in the QB (six examples). The DLT’s kirça- ‘to scrape‘ (with kirčal- ‘to get wounded‘) comes from * kèr-ìš+a- (cf. Uygur kıršal-). After /š/ this happens even in Uygur: tutši ‘continuous‘, syncopated from *tut-ùš-ì, often becomes miči (examples in OTWF 343), in the QB even spelled as miči when demanded by the metre. Cf. also katı(SC)zızin “without any admixture” (Bhadraçarya ṣa. Stabreimtexte 145), from kat-ìš- ‘to mix‘, again with the vowel of the formative syncopated.

mür ,honey‘, men ‘flour‘, maqal ‘luck etc.’, mahabut ‘element‘, madar ‘monster‘ and murut ‘pear‘ are examples for loan words starting with /m/; in Turkic words in Uygur texts, onset /ml/ appears also when the following consonant is a nasal (e.g. mæriz ‘complexion‘) or when it was a nasal prehistorically (e.g. meyi ‘brain‘ < *bāni). nom ,ethics; treatise, text‘, nirvan ‘nirvaṇa‘, noš ‘elixir‘, nipur ‘foot jewellery‘ or nizyanı =

¹⁸⁵ The modern Chinese word of this shape and meaning originally had a final consonant which should have been borrowed into Old Turkic; what we have appears to have resulted from contamination between that word and Turkic či: ‘dew‘ etc., attested (together with verbal derivates) in the DLT and in many modern languages.
Skt. kleśa show onset /nl/. nayrag ‘characteristic mark of Buddha’ may be an early loan from Mongolic, which also has a related verb naira-; this noun is attested already in the Mait. inarū ‘forward, onward’ lost its onset vowel in Qarakhanid, appearing as narū both in the DLT and the QB; by that time, onset /nl/ appears to have become acceptable for common pronunciation. At least some variants of Old Turkic may have had (free or conditioned) alternation between the pronunciations of /l/ and /nl/ in onset position, seeing that they are considered equivalent for the rote rhyme in stanza 18 of the alphabetical verse starting in ET§ p. 106. The BuddhKat text in Tibetan script writes thrice lom for nom ‘teaching’; the editor’s note thereto mentions that the old name of Lop in Lop noor in Xinjiang was Nop. Old Turkic jačin ‘falcon’ appears in Mongolian as način; the latter may be the source of the word, since onset /nl/ was normal for originally Mongolic stems. lom and jačin could both have resulted from nasal dissimilation, as found in (Mongolic) Dagur, which also has lom (and also e.g. in Spanish alma < Latin anima). Lop cannot be explained in this way, however, nor can Mongol nayaču > laggac ‘male relative on mother’s side’ on 1.96 of a recently published text.\(^\text{186}\) The common Turkic plural suffix +\lAr is no doubt related to its Mongol synonym +\nAr; it also shows /ll/ where the latter has /nl/. A word starting with /l/ and retaining it in onset position is attested already in Orkhon Turkic: In BQ S10 we find lagzín ‘pork’. lu ‘dragon’, lenxwa ‘lotus’, lim ‘pillar, beam’, labay ‘a shell; a pumpkin; a musical instrument’ lurzi ‘stick, club’ or jačin ‘falcon’ are terms found in Uygur not linked to any religious system; the terms starting with /ll/ borrowed in religious contexts are, of course, much more numerous. lā+la- ‘to slash, cut in stripes’ is derived from a Chinese term using the formative +lA-. /ll/ is hardly ever attested in onset position; one example is račavi(l)rt ‘lapis lazuli’, which comes from Sanskrit rājāvarta.

The main strategy for getting rid of unusual onset consonants of borrowings was to put a vowel before them, usually the same as the one following them. Thus commonly with borrowings with /ll/ in the onset, e.g. in aram ay, the name of the first month in the Indian year, \(\ll\) Skt. rāma, orehit(a)k \(\ll\) Skt. rohita(ka), the name of a devout fish (UIV D 119 and a fragment in the note thereto), ārdini ‘jewel’ \(\ll\) Skt. ratna (still attested as rtṇi / rāṇi / rdṇi 12 times in Manichæan texts),

orohini, the name of a constellation, << rohini, arsayin and arsiyan (BT III 74 etc.) as variant of rasayan << rasâyana, or arži , a holy man’ << Skt. ṛṣi. See the UW for the shape of this latter (spelled with onset R at least in two instances in Uygur Brāhmī and not given an onset alef in Sogdian). Cf. araxu ‘the planet Râhu’ in BT III 162, urum ‘Byzantium, i.e. Eastern Rome’ in BT III 1036 and elsewhere. Note, though, that, which shows that, at least In the dialect of the Uygur steppe empire the same happened with onset /l/; lu ‘dragon’ appears as ulu in Tariat W 2. The common binome öl ši ‘moisture, wetness’ appears as öl iši (or perhaps with secondary fronting as öl iši) in U 2381 r10 edited by Peter Zieme in AOH 55(2002): 281-295. Foreign words with an onset /zl/ or /št/ also receive a vowel before that: z(ā)rwā is still attested in a ms. in Sogdian script but appears as āzrwā everywhere else; the astrological term ūtim is attested in TT VIII as ātim.

Another way to get rid of unusual onset consonants was to drop them, as with /tʃ/ in akšazlar ‘the rāḵasas’ (DḥāṢū 15), awrap << Skt. raurava (Mait 83r22 and 23) and ačagārḥ ‘Rājaṅgha’ in ETŠ 19.4; the pronunciation of the latter is secured by its alliterating with several words all starting with /la/. /l/ could get dropped in the same way: Two examples of ala- < la+la- ‘to slash’ (see above) are mentioned in OTWF 441.

2.405. Consonant clusters and their resolution
Old Turkic originally had no consonant clusters at the beginnings of words, affixes or even syllables. In Uygur we find onset consonant clusters in borrowed words such as frišti ‘angel’, pra ‘canopy’, kšan ‘a moment’, trižul ‘trident’, dyan ‘meditation’, tsun ‘inch’, psak ‘wreath, garland’, stup ‘Buddhist sanctuary’ or tsuy ‘sin’. Clusters in the onset of syllables, as in the second syllable of lenxwa ‘lotus’, are against the rules of native Turkic but are never spelled in any other way. We may not be sure exactly how these were actually pronounced, as their spelling must have been traditional; it usually followed that of the giver language, but this statement makes no sense when one thinks of Chinese, the source of lenxwa. Note, on the other hand, spellings such as pīret ‘preta, a demon’ e.g. in MaitH XV 4r5 or 5r18, kšan in DKPAMPb 1053 or girant (Abhi A 3095), ultimately from Sanskrit.

---

187 The binome (and not just iši / iši by itself, as translated by the editor) here appears to be a euphemism for ‘urine’. To connect this iši to Turkish içe- ‘to urinate’ does not imply disconnecting it from ši; I take the Turkish verb to be secondary.

188 The second part of the Mongol (Secret History) female proper name Alan ʿīsā no doubt represents the same source.
Grantha ‘a treatise, section’. For ślok, ‘verse’ we have variants like śulok and šilök (first vowel possibly to be pronounced as [ël]), which are assimilated to Turkic pronunciation. Clusters in the syllable onset of foreign words are often broken apart by high vowels, especially in late texts; e.g. may tres → may tel. We even find such phenomena in Turkic words, e.g. titirä for titräm ‘to tremble’ (Candrasútra I1e5); dividing that into the syllables tit and rä would place /r/ into syllable onset, which is, in Old Turkic, also avoided where possible. Occasionally there is a low vowel, as in karžul ‘trident’ (Scripture of the ten kings, the 2nd court).

dyan ‘meditation’ is, however, spelled as a monosyllable 14 times in Brähmi texts, presumably reflecting the real pronunciation of the scribes. We should also remember that dyan has survived unchanged to this day (in Altay Turkic).

Chinese onset [ts] (and perhaps [dz]) are often simplified to [s] (and [z]), e.g. in the forms suy ‘sin’ and say ‘barn’ which appear beside the more common tsuy and tsay. Tsuy ‘sin’ became say in Xw 218, 219 and 221, an early text, showing a different strategy. See Shogalto 1986 (1987): 128 ff. and the note to HTs VIII 389 for further examples.

Another process was for the cluster to get preceded by a vowel, as in astup ‘stūpa’ (Sūv 627,20) or āstiramati – āsidiramati (frequently in Abhi) < Skt. sthiramati.

In words of Turkic origin onset clusters came up secondarily: In section 2.403 we discussed the cluster tr°, which comes either from a syncopation of the sequence /turul/ or from the introduction of an intrusive /ll/ to break up clusters like /ll/. The diminutive suffix +klyA, < +klnyā (still appearing as +knyā in an early Uygur text, M I 23,32) is practically always spelled as +kyA in Uygur, with an onset cluster. This includes some but not all Brähmi instances; azkiya is spelled in three syllables in Maue 1996 4,75 and 95, oglankiya in four syllables in Maue 21 Nr. 109. Moreover, as pointed out in UW 155b under antak(y)a ok, a bisyllabic pronunciation of the suffix is called for also

---

189 Auxiliary vowels as in anantIrIš ‘one of a set of grave sins’, ardIr ‘a moon station’, šaśIr ‘doctrinal text’, pāṭIr ‘leaf’, vačIr ‘thunderbolt; diamond’ or apiRamanI ‘quality which a bodhisattva has incommensurately’ should in principle be transcribed to accord with vowel harmony, since they get introduced in Turkic and not in the source language: some of them alternate with alef more than they would do if they had a front pronunciation. Cf. Erdal 2002: 19-20.
in the Prajñāparamitāstotra published in the ETŚ because of the very regular verse.\(^{190}\)

Note, further, the particle spelled as ymä in all Uygur scripts, also in the dozens of examples in Brähmi (where spellings of Türkic words seem to be especially close to pronunciation). The absence of an explicit vowel in the instances of this particle appearing in runiform script cannot, however, mean that there was no vowel in the inscriptions in this position, and T.Tekin 1968: 170 (and elsewhere) might well be right in spelling the word as yämä; he considers it to have originally been a converb and provides it with an Altaic etymology. In Qarakhanid (examples quoted in the EDPT) the word is spelled as a bisyllable (though the occasional spelling with e is likely to be due to the secondary influence of the /y/). For Uygur, however, the possibility of pronunciation with an onset cluster appears to have been a fact; this cluster proved to be unstable in the long run, ymä turning into clitic mA with synharmonism.

The sound change witnessed in ymä is not limited to that particle but appears to have been responsible for a number of variants which we find in Brähmi sources: It can be formulated as \#yVCV\(^{o}\) > \#yCV\(^{o}\), and apparently consists in the /yl/ (often) becoming syllabic. One example for it is yge in ršïlarda yge ‘the best among the wise’ in TT VIII D 6. We have dozens of Brähmi examples of yeg ‘better, best’ spelled with a vowel, but when the 3\(^{rd}\) person possessive suffix (here with the assimilation [i > e] because of the /e/ in the first syllable) gets added, this stem vowel gets syncopated. We find that all vowels can sporadically get dropped, in words such as yağı ‘first decade of the month’, yara-gay, yara-d-miš, yara-si, yara-tiğ, yara-ti-, yara-tin-, yegirmi, yeti (‘seven’ > yete) and yeti+nč, yïg-ip, yïgil-, yïgin-, yigač, yïlan, yil-ip, yevïg, yenä ‘again’, yïrïn ‘light coloured, white’. Yegirmi ‘twenty’ is spelled without its first vowel in all 8 of its Brähmi instances; we know that it was le/ firstly because of the fluctuation i ~ Ø appearing in this word in the Orkhon sources, and secondly because assimilation makes its second vowel turn up as e in most of the Brähmi instances (and its third turn up as e in nearly half of them).\(^{191}\) Cf. also spellings like YGRMYYH in Manichaean script in M III Nr.2 2 r 1 or YGRMYNC

\(^{190}\) Röhnborn thinks the fact that the final alef is written separately would also speak for a bisyllabic pronunciation; this spelling (found also in aya ‘palm of the hand’) probably intends to preclude a reading as +kIn.

\(^{191}\) The DLT has yegirmi as main entry and yegirmi as ‘variant’. Three among its four instances are not vocalised in the first syllable; in the fourth a fatha was crossed out by a second hand and replaced by a kasra.
in Uygur writing in M I 15,16, or YRT- for yarat- in M I 14-15,5, 8, 10, 13,17 and the like.\textsuperscript{192} The fact that yimšak `soft’ in KT S 5 and 6 and BQ twice N 4, yincũ ‘pearl’ in KT S 3 and BQ N 3, yir ‘north’ in KT E 34 and BQ N 3 and yiper ‘scent’ in BQ S 11 are all spelled without vowel in the first syllable (and with y\textsuperscript{2} instead of y\textsuperscript{1}) is, I am convinced, an indication that this vowel was dropped in Orkhon Turkic: These are the only instances in these two inscriptions where a non-expressed first-syllable vowel is not /a/ or /ä/ (whereas the relevant rule appears to have been applied slightly more laxly in the other Orkhon inscriptions). If we find a spelling like YI YLM’Q in TT IX 117, we are entitled to assume that the vowel of the first syllable of yigil- was reduced if not dropped; the ms. otherwise shows only the usual spellings without vowel, which are merely graphic.

Section 2.34 describes an alternation #yV° ~ #V°, stated to be a reflex of *h\textsuperscript{2}, a phoneme appearing in Proto-Turkic at the beginning of words. In a few unclear cases\textsuperscript{193} an unstable #yV° may not be the reflex of such an *h/\textsuperscript{2}, the vowel following it being different in the alternants: BQ E31 writes yipagut where the parallel text in KT N7 can be read as alpagut ‘warrior’. Cf. also the variants imrak (TT X 346), yamrak (KP 16,3)\textsuperscript{194} and y(i)mrak (HandschrReste II 75 and M III text 22, 39,2) of amrak ‘dear’. The relationship between yaltrï- ‘to gleam, glimmer’ and its variants (OTWF 482) and various forms like yiltïra-, yiltïr- and yiltrak (‘gleam’, QB) may be either a phonetic or a synesthetic one. There also is a verb yëcan- ~ ičan- ~ yačan- discussed in OTWF 600-601. Orkhon Turkic and Uygur iğač ‘tree’ appears as yigač in Qarakhanid.

Phonotactic rules allow no vowel sequences in Old Turkic words of Turkic origin.\textsuperscript{195} We do, however, find a sequence spelled ua in borrowings such as lenxwa, ‘lotus’ and äźrwa, the name of a Manichaean and of a Buddhist deity; these are exceptions both to this rule and to synharmonism. These words contain an abnormal vowel sequence if they were pronounced as len–xu–a and äz–ru–a. If xwa in the name of the flower consisted of one syllable (as in Chinese, the source

\textsuperscript{192} To judge by some spelling statistics, high vowels may have more readily gotten syncopated than low vowels: yegirmi appears to get spelled more often without vowel than yarat-.

\textsuperscript{193} Unclear also because they are so few compared with the normal spelling.

\textsuperscript{194} Thus the UW entry with question mark, while Hamilton simply writes ’MRX: to me it looks like a Y corrected to an alef.

\textsuperscript{195} In one ms. in Sogdian writing (a fragment from the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra), we once find the postposition eyin spelled as ’YN, which might have been meant to be read as (bisyllabic) e’in. This is not sufficient evidence to assume the existence of a medial glottal stop in Old Turkic; it might be a mere error or a matter of spelling.
language), it would constitute a violation of the Turkic rule which bars consonant clusters in the word onset; but then there are quite a number of borrowings with onset cluster in our sources. One possibility is to read *len-xu-wa*, as a consonant *w* is found also in other loans. See Maue 1996: XXVI-XXVII for how the question was dealt with in texts in Brähmi writing.

Clusters of three consonants always appear to involve one of the sonants */l n r/*. Examples are the stems *yaltrï*- and *yultrï*- (both spelled with *dēl* – not *dhēl* – in the DLT), *koltgula*, *adîrta*, *körünclâ*, *tancêgala*, *târkla*, *amürtgür*, *körtgür* and the adverb *tärtrü*.

Originally consonant clusters were permitted only at the end of syllables or across syllable borders. The possibilities for syllable-closing clusters are, in Turkic words, limited to *nt* (e.g. *ant* ‘oath’), *rt* (e.g. *rt* ‘mountain pass’), *lt* (e.g. *tölt* ‘pillow’), *lp* (e.g. *alp* ‘heroic; difficult’), *rk* (e.g. *ärk* ‘power’), *lk* (e.g. *alk* ‘to destroy’), *nc* (e.g. *kânc* ‘baby’), *rc* (e.g. *yurc* ‘brother-in-law’) and *rs* (e.g. *târs* ‘awry; misguided’). Note that the first element in all of these clusters is */r/*, */l/* or */n/*.

These are the ‘sonants’, after which */(b) d g/* (when followed by vowels) appear in their stop and not their fricative variant; the second element is always voiceless in the coda of syllables. Before the syllable border */n/* is followed only by */l* or */l/*, with which it shares its point of articulation. Additional clusters found in loans into Uygur may accord only with one of these two limitations, e.g. in *leš* ‘phlegm’ or *bodisavt*, or with none, as in *bodisatv* ‘bodhisattva’; but the last mentioned might have been pronounced as *bodisatf*. The DLT quotes *leš* ‘phlegm’ from the Čigil dialect, which means that that dialect, at any rate, assimilated it to Turkic phonotactics; *lešip* in the Suv and elsewhere shows another way of coming to terms with the irregularity. Concerning the term for ‘bodhisattva’ (which had already lost its coda vowel before it reached Turkic), the variant *bodisatv* already represents movement toward Turkic rules, as it is the second and not the first consonant that is voiceless; eventually the word got fully assimilated either by dropping the alveolar or by introducing a

---

196 See OTWF 425 for the shape of this noun. I know of no Old Turkic examples for final */l*.

197 Words like *üst* or *ast*, which appear in the EDPT, are nonexistent in Old Turkic; these two are misrepresentations of *üstün* and *astün*, formed with the orientational formative +*tXn*.

198 In Uygur (and Middle Turkic) *üşk* ‘presence’ the first element is not a sonant, but this word is always used with possessive suffix; i.e. */şk/* never appears in phonetically final position. In late texts, *üşkintä* often undergoes metathesis to give *üksintä*. 
vowel between the two final consonants. Such vowels sometimes appear even in ‘normal’ Old Turkic clusters, leading to fluctuations such as elt- ~ elit- ‘to lead’ or, in late texts, bürit- beside bürt- ‘to touch’.\textsuperscript{199} The limitation that the second consonant of Turkic coda clusters had to be voiceless meant that the formative -(O)k could drop its onset vowel after stems ending in /tʃ/ in words such as kör-‘shape’, ör-k and tur-k ‘length, height’ whereas -(X)g couldn’t: Cf. sor-ug, sür-üg, tur-ug, ur-ug and yör-üg. The formative -(X)nɛ appears to come from the morpheme sequence -(X)n-(X)ʃ after the second formative lost its vowel and would have given the impossible cluster *nʃ; cf. OTWF 275-277.

The word for ‘sheep’, originally koñ, is in Uygur generally spelled as koyn. In MaitH XX 13r29 the editors write ‘koy(u)n’, presumably thinking that the word had two syllables; that is unlikely because no second vowel appears in any of the rather numerous instances. For a similar reason it is also unlikely that (as Doerfer 1993: 139 thinks) it was an archaic spelling for what had already become /y/. Nor is it very likely that there should have been a coda cluster consisting of the consonants /ɭ/ and /n/ as there is a voiceless consonant as second element in all such clusters. The spelling YN could have been meant to indicate retained [ņ] or nasalised y, but then the question is why this sound should have been retained throughout Uygur in this word and not in others which also had /n/ in the coda.

Across syllable borders there are very much more possibilities for having consonant sequences, though not everything is possible; evidence is listed in Clauson 1962: 169. Even in this position, clusters occasionally get simplified; tisilär for tisi+lär ‘students’ in BT V 13 or taysi for taytsi in HTs VII 967 must be phonetic spellings;\textsuperscript{200} BT V 13 also shows tt > t and kk > k even across morpheme boundaries. /ɭ/ was quite possible in the beginning of syllables, e.g. in orṇut ‘flag; general’ and orṛut ‘general’, köžũ ‘mirror’ or yalŋuk ‘human being’ (< yalŋ+u- with syncopation). Scholars have generally not trusted the mss. in this matter, emending to ort(ʊ)ŋut (very often), yal(a)ŋuk (e.g. in MaitH XX 13r16) or köz(ʊ)ŋũ (e.g. in DreiPrinz 57). Later Uygur did introduce helping vowels here (see next paragraph), but there is no reason to assume that all speakers did so or that this was an early phenomenon.

\textsuperscript{199} Alternately, elt- could have been syncopated from elit-, and bürit- could have come about because the verb was re-interpreted as an -Xt- causative (which had the shape -It- in late texts.)

\textsuperscript{200} The latter is called “falsch” by the editor, who apparently expected Uygur and Chinese phonetics to be identical.
The shorter forms are actually attested more often and are highly likely to be the original ones.

In relatively late texts medial clusters, especially ones involving /r/, secondarily get broken up by ‘helping’ vowels; e.g. ödräk ‘duck’ > ödiräk, sädiräk (ET Ş 12.8, UigTot 918) < südräk ‘sparse’, otirakü (Abhi A 109a9) < otra+kü (< orto ‘middle’), sačirayu in- ‘to leap out’ (Suv 315,5, BT XIII 19,76) < sačra-, yaltüryu (BT III 997) < yaltri- ‘to glisten’, amirán- (UigTot 116) < amran- ‘to love’, amuru, amiru < amru ‘continously’, basurok (ShōAv 317) and basuroklu (BT XIII 39,22) < basrok, oruyu(t) < orayu(t) ‘general’ (examples in OTWF 79-80), kängrág (BT III 972) < kängra, müngirä- (BT III 270) < müngra-, maŋran- ‘to call out’ (ShōAv 274, Shō XII b 12) < maŋra-, öngirä < öŋ+ra (U III 889), tägärä < tägrä (TT VII 29), sofira < sof+ra (BT III 891). When, in late Uygur texts (ET Ş 13,162, BT II 960) uturu ‘facing’ replaces normal utru, this is likelier to come from such a process than to be a case of retention of the original stem vowel. The additional vowel in the word spelled sädiräk (< südräk) in ET Ş 12.8 does not count as a syllable in verse; this could mean that a scribe introduced it and not the author.

Equally in late texts auxiliary vowels occasionally appear also when no /r/ is around: with /h/ we have, e.g., taŋusok ‘wondrous’ (Ernte 62, BT XIII 46,35), from taŋ+rok, äŋmiš < äŋ-miš (BT III 381 as discussed in UW 381), öŋluğ < öŋ+lug (BT III 1010) and öŋdün < öŋ+dün (BT III 229); with /l/ e.g. tëğülök (KPZieme 1) < tëgl-ök ‘blind’. Another stem involving the difficult cluster /rŋ/ may have occurred in *irŋa- ‘to shake (tr.)’, which was either broken up by an anaptyctic vowel as in irŋag (BT XIII 25,8), or underwent metathesis as in irŋag (BT VIII B 88; Kinkashō A,d) or gave up its nasality as in irŋag (many examples; see OTWF 188).

/lr/ is prone to get dropped. This sometimes happens even in permitted coda clusters: bärk ‘tough’ normally appears as bâk, tärtrü ‘inverted, crosswise, in the wrong direction’ often as tâtrü (documented in OTWF 729) and kurtgar- ‘to save’ often as kutgar- (OTWF 735-6). +lAkA becomes +lAkA in ulug ışlaka ‘to great affairs’, ašlaka ‘for feasts’ and kışlaka ‘during the winters’ (DLT fol. 294) and bilgeläkä ‘to the wise ones’ (fol. 112). The /lr/ of the formative -dUrXk is dropped in burun+duruk > burunduk ‘nose ring’, where the base also has an /lr/; see OTWF 104-5. The postposition birlä gets simplified to bilä in later
CHAPTER TWO

Uygur. ketmän ‘hoe, mattock’ may come from kärt- ‘to notch’. The conditional suffix -sA consistently appears as -sA not only in Qarakhanid and such late lay texts as the ones collected in Heilk but also in BuddhKat (though very rarely in the numerous examples for the conditional found in Brähmi texts); /r/ is occasionally dropped in the aorist suffix as well. The Brähmi ms. TT VIII 1 has a number of instances of the loss of /r/ as a type of haplology (section 2.4.12).

Double consonants often get simplified, double /l/ e.g. in kölüg < kö+lük (U III 39,25, UigOn II A 1, TT X 276), bächlig < bächällig (BT V 21,456), kuluk < kul+luk (KP 23,3), talan- (Heilk II p. 4, colophon) < *talu+la-n-, elän- < el+lä-n-, yeläyü ‘ostensible, apparent’ < yel+lä-yü etc.; tükälig < tükäl+lig is especially common. Thence, elig ‘king’ no doubt comes from el+lig ‘having a realm’, olär ‘they’ < *ol+lar202 and ulug ‘great’ possibly < ul+lug ‘having a sole or base’. Simplification is most common with velars, e.g. korku < kork-gu (DKPAMPb 81). We also have simplified dative forms: kiekiä tägi < kieki+g+kä tägi (Xw ms. R r 16), suvsamaka ... katıglamaka (for -mAk+kA) in TT II,1 37-38, oruka < oruk ‘path’ +kA (M III 7 III r 3), adaka < adak+ka (M I 5,13) konaka < konak+ka in BT V 13 etc.;203 the dative spelled as iringä in Manichæan writing in M I 5,14 can explain the shape of the pronominal dative. Velar simplification is usual in word formation, e.g. yarlıka- ‘to pity’ < yarlıgka- and agrıkan- ‘to feel pain’ < *agrıg+ka-n-; talgok ~ talkok ‘fastening peg’ < talk-gok, sukak ‘male gazelle’ (DLT etc.) presumably < *suk-gak, from suk- ‘to thrust (with the horns)’ and yulkak (or yulgak) iš ‘swindling’ < yulk- ‘to get some use or profit from something’ (Mait 62 v 14) with the same simplification. We have the evidence of DLT fol. 202 that tikän ‘thorn’ comes from tik-gän, i.e. ‘the stinging one’. kömür ‘coal’ is derived with the formative -mXr (OTWF 390), either from köñ- ‘to burn’, or from köm- ‘to bury’; cf. kömäc, a round loaf which is buried in hot ashes’ with the formative -mÄc, which forms names for dishes (OTWF 319).

201 kärti / kärgi ‘adze’ may come from the same stem but in the latter two lexemes the /t/ and not the /r/ is dropped. The simplification ärklig > ärilig is discussed in the UW entry for ärklig.

202 Unless ol, whose /l/ has no parallel anywhere in the language, came about through metanalysis of olär. Note that all the sources quoted here are Manichæan; this need not be a phonetic characteristic of a Manichæan dialect, however, but could also be due to laxer (or perhaps more phonetic) spelling conventions.

203 Same passage as the previous instance. irin+kä would have been normal. For the n before the ç cf. irinç for irinç four lines before and also further on in the text; such spellings are typical for pre-classical texts.
Alveolars are simplified mainly in late texts, e.g. *arduš < art-daš (eight times in the QB), *kutadur- < kutad-dur- and *örlätür- < örlät-dür- (both ETŞ 10) and *kotur- < kod-dur- (twice Suv). However, cf. also *aytilar < ayt-tilar in BT V 13, a Manichaean source.\(^{205}\) We do not know whether such simplification took place in the language of the runiform inscriptions, as double consonants are there usually spelled as simple ones (cf. T.Tekin 1968: 47-48).

The simplification tč > č, at any rate, is already attested in Orkhon Turkic: I agree with the reading očok ‘stove’ in Tuñ 8. očok < *ot+čok is attested also in three among six mss. in TT VI 86; the rest of them and some late texts write otčok (see OTWF 108), but there probably was not much phonetic difference: Phonetically speaking, it all amounts to [VTv[V] vs. [VTv[V]. We also find edärči (TT IV A 57) < edär-t+či (QB) ‘tracker’, očči (QB) < okt-t+či and kócči (DLT) < köt+čok ‘buttocks’. If otačič ‘medical doctor’ comes from *ot+ač+čič ‘a person busy with small herbs’, it would show the simplification of double č.\(^{206}\)

On the other hand, the form kätčiğizčiń (= kač-ig+sič+ćiń) quoted in Zieme 1991: 145 shows that [č] could be spelled as TC. ištin < ic+ićin in Lo9,5 and Mi17,11 in SammlUigKontr 2 is again different: Phonetically speaking, this is VčjV > VićjV. With this word, the simplification could have been helped by parallelism with taštın: We find ištìn nom taštın el ‘(may) religion in the spiritual domain and the state in the physical domain (prevail)’ already in M III Nr.27 v16.

### 2.406. Metathesis

In late texts there are metatheses of clusters with /t/, e.g. ördäk > ödrük, buštir ‘wrinkle’ < *bur(u)š- (cf. OTWF 344), sarya- (BuddhUig I 335) < sayra- ‘to twitter’, särki- (Hochzeit 32) < sekri- ‘to leap’, orpak < opra-k ‘shabby’, buryuk < buyruk ‘minister’, ägräk < äŋäk ‘finger’, örgag ~ öṛag, orto ‘middle’ > otrā (and further otrā) and so forth. ädräm < ærdäm ‘virtue’ appears in MaitH, which is not a very late text. Among the variants kutrul- ‘to be saved’ and kurtul- the former is

---

\(^{205}\) OTWF 870 (index under „geminate simplification”) refers to further examples of the phenomenon.

\(^{206}\) In HTs VII 1174, Arlottò had read a word to be analysed as kör-ané+či-lär as köränčiär and Röhrborn 1994:108 had explained this as just such a simplification. In his edition of the text, Röhrborn now sees two Ĉs, and in a note to the passage states that a helping vowel is sometimes introduced in such cases, „um einer Vereinfachung der Geminate vorzubeugen, ... wie im Falle von sakšenči und y(t)ařškaxči (vgl. Abit list 103)“. The matter (and the passage referred to) are commented on in OTWF 114-115; it is, however, related to the alternation between -čiń (OTWF section 3.104) and -čińčiń (OTWF section 3.105), which is a more complex phenomenon.
probably the original, but both are rather common from quite early sources on; see OTWF 667-8 for some of the examples.207 yaltïr- (ETŞ 20,64) < yaltïr- ‘to gleam’ and ogurla- ‘to steal’ < *ögrï+la- (discussed in OTWF 441-2) show /l/ exchanging places with an adjacent vowel; see OTWF 313 for yogurt ‘yoghurt’ ~ yogrut ~ yorgut. In other cases /l/ gets dropped by dissimilation, as in ämirkäš- < *ämri-rkäš- (BT III 990) or bakïr- ‘to shout’ < *bar+kïr- (cf. Mo. barkira- etc. and Turkish bar bar bagr- ‘to shout loudly’). Connections such as kükürt / kükälät- ‘to thunder’, tigirt / tigrä- ‘to clatter’, mañïrt / mañra- ‘to bellow’, täpi(r)t+siz / täprä- ‘to move’ and in fact the relationship between the formative +kIr- and verbs ending in velar + ?rA- show how wide-spread sound change around /r/ was in onomatopoeias.

In OTWF 569 we took täš gürüš- to come from tägš-ür-üš by the change /gš/ > /šg/; the process making tüzgin- in the QB from the common tägzin- ‘to revolve’ and üksintä ‘in his presence’ < üsk+in+tä is similar, all involving velars and sibilants. OTWF 358-359 shows -kUç and -çUk to be metathesis variants, the latter appearing after bases ending in /l/ or /n/. Metathesis took place also with yalvïr < yavlak in AlttüSogd 89, with yamgur < yagmur ‘rain’ in Totenbuch. Qarakhanid Turkic küzäd- ‘to guard etc.’ > küdäz- (together with derivates) may have taken place under the influence of synonymous küd-.

2.407. Parasitical consonants
There sometimes appears a parasitical alveolar between /l/, /r/ or /n/ and a following velar or /l/, e.g. in kolტgïči ‘beggar’ < kol-gu+či, probably also in the causatives amïrtgur- ‘to pacify’ < *amïr-gur-, körtgür- ‘to show’ / körtkïr- < *kör-gïr- and kïndgär- < *kïn(i)+gïr- (DLT fol. 365). The alveolars in the DLT verbs çâldrä-, kaldra- and küldrâ- (OTWF 471) are secondary. Another example is the form oltrup in M II 11,13, the converb of olor- ‘to sit’: When the second vowel of the stem is syncopated and the /l/ and /l/ get into adjacency, a /t/ intervenes. This cluster appears to have been preferred to having a syllable start with /l/ while the previous one ended in /l/; this eventually led to the replacement of Old Turkic olor- ‘to sit’ by Qarakhanid and later oltur-:
The /t/ was subsequently kept also in forms whose suffix did not start with a vowel. To make that adapt to Old Turkic phonotactics, a vowel had, in a second step, to be introduced between the /l/ and the /l/. For

---

207 kutul-, another early and widespread variant, could have come from contamination with kut ‘good spirit’.
the same reason Uygur olr-ug was replaced by Qarakhanid oldr-ug.\textsuperscript{208} The passage ſ > č after /r/ or /n/, which presumably takes place in kirča- < kirš+a- and -(X)nč < -(X)n-(X)š, can be seen as a related phenomenon, [č] being equivalent to [ts]: Here, that is, we also witness the introduction of an alveolar between two syllables, one ending with /r/ or /n/ and the other starting with a consonant.

2.408. Consonant assimilation
Assimilation between consonants can concern a number of features. We will first deal with the voice feature, then with that of nasality, next with the mode of obstruction and finally with place of articulation. Consonants can also be influenced by vowels, dealt with last in this section.

Assimilation of voicelessness between adjacent consonants is the rule in Qarakhanid but not in any other variety of Old Turkic. Still, it can be shown to have taken place in a few cases in Uygur as well. In Ht X 796, e.g., yîlîg+kya is spelled with two dots on the g, indicating that the word was pronounced as yîlik'ya; /g/ appears to become voiceless also before /l/, in the verb stems agtar-, agtin- and agtur- discussed in section 2.34. This is backward assimilation between consonants. In other – exceedingly rare – cases, voicelessness spreads forwards, e.g. in eštîr- < eşid-ûr- ‘to proclaim’ and kôm-ûš-tâči ‘burying each other’ in completely destroyed context (M III 32,2, Wilkens 48). /č-gü/ appears as /čkü/ in Xw 82 in the London ms., which is in Manichæan script (in which front G and K are quite distinct letters).\textsuperscript{209} tütz-ük ‘incense (stick)’ comes from tüt-üz- ‘to fumigate’, but the form with /z/ is attested only once (Windg 36): This common lexeme is otherwise (even in early texts such as the Mait) always spelled as tütük. Similarly säkiz on ‘80’ and tokuz on ‘90’ become sâksön and tokson in the DLT.

\textsuperscript{208} The existence of ‘olturmiš’, made up in Johanson 2000: 62 as Old Turkic, is highly unlikely in that language. The EDPT considers yartîm to be a secondary form of yarîm ‘half’, “with an intrusive -t-”, however, an intrusive t never appears before a vowel.

\textsuperscript{209} The use of K might have been meant to show stop (as opposed to fricative) pronunciation at syllable onset; . elî-kây ‘(they) will convey (him)’ in M III nr.12 r7 does not mean too much as the text in several cases confuses voiced and unvoiced consonants (yâg for yâk ‘demon’ etc.). The value of /čkü/ should not be overrated either, as the ms. may have had a source text in Uygur script. We can make the same assumption for the Mahrnûmag (= Müller, Doppelblatt), whose first part is dated to the year 762, because the Uygur ruler is called ay täbulmïš alp bilgä uyur uyun and not uyun (confusion of âlef and nûn) and because ‘prince’ is, in that text (in Manichæan writing) indiscriminately spelled as TGYN, TKYN and TQYN (Manichæan Q not being characteristic of back-vowel context).
section 2.410 we have a different explanation for why the formative 
<-(X)z-(X)k-, has /s/ in its onset.

On the other hand, what at first sight looks like a backward
dissimilation in voice has been noted for the instances of suffixes
starting with an alveolar (e.g. the causative suffix -tUr-) when they
appear after /t/: As observed in OTWF 830-831, the result is td whether
the stem ends in /t/ or /d/, in fact also when the suffix (e.g. the preterite
morpheme) starts with /d/. Spellings like kodum < kod-, yadilä < yad-
dülä (HTs VIII 73), ütdä < üüd ‘time’, unit-dür- or yokatdur- < yokad-
are common in texts which otherwise do not confuse alveolars. This
rather consistent habit can be understood to indicate that the first
alveolar was pronounced strongly (as a stop?) and the second softly (as
a fricative?).

Johanson 2001: 1726b is of the opinion that the relative absence of
progressive devoicing in Old Turkic (the phenomenon being the rule in
subsequent stages of the language) is due to the presence of short
unwritten vowels at the end of stems. This is an ad hoc hypothesis set
forth in great detail in Johanson 1979: 68 ff., whose material base is
narrow indeed: Firstly, some Mongolic cognates of Turkic elements
often have an additional vowel but the explanation of this discrepancy
may in many cases not lie within Turkic but within Mongolic. When
such vowels were dropped at the end of verb stems, they reappear
within the aorist suffix, as pointed out by various scholars including
Johanson, I myself and T.Tekin; there is no reason to take them to have
been retained if they are not spelled out. Secondly, the Turkic-
Khotanese word list (Emmerick & Rona-Tas 1992) has the shwa
character transcribed as ä which signals the lack of any vowel at the end
of words. When it is used within words, it appears not only before
suffixes and not especially after /p t s/ etc., as Johanson 1979: 73 says,
but a number of times also after /l/ and /l/, e.g. in kirpiq ‘eyelash’ or
sakaldruk ‘throat strap for headstall’.210 This disqualifies the point he is
trying to make, as do the numerous voice assimilations taking place
with consonants having the same place of articulation, which he himself
discusses subsequently. No invisible vowels can therefore be made
responsible for the fact that voice assimilation is marginal in Old Turkic;
voice assimilation is not a universal phenomenon, and Old Turkic
differs from modern languages also in other significant ways.

---

210 A word spelled baš-sizsa said in Johanson 1979: 73 to represent baš+siz seems
not to appear in that text and I wonder where (if at all) it could have existed. If the
author created it to illustrate his point (which would in itself be legitimate), he does not
actually say so.
The forms ämäjän- (twice) and ämäjäk (twice) in BuddhKat come from ämägän- and ämägäk and thus show progressive assimilation in nasality. ögrän- < ögrän- in HTs VIII 43 is (if the N should not be interpreted as a superfluous alef) similar but regressive. A better known form of non-contact regressive nasal assimilation takes place when onset /b/ is followed by a vowel and then a nasal; we then have /bl > /ml/, e.g. in bün ‘I’ > män. um-du+či ‘beggar’ from um- ‘to hope’ is spelled as uttuči in ShōAv 21; this is no doubt a case of regressive assimilation in the point of articulation, since both /n/ and /d/ are alveolars.

A phonotactic phenomenon involving consonants and attested only in back-vowel environment is that stops become fricatives before /š/. In this position, /k/ appears as [x] e.g. DLT čaxša- and Uygur čaxšaš- < *čak-iš+a-; yaxšingu ‘sleeve cuffs’ is attested in HTs VII 1292, /p/ appears as [f], e.g. in yafšı ‘to adhere, be attached to’ < yapıš-, spelled with f in Pothi 127, which is in Manichaean writing. This is a case of assimilation, as spirants like š are, of course, also fricatives. Uygur probably distinguished between oxša- ‘to caress’ and oğša- ‘to resemble’ (/g/ realised as a fricative); the latter is six times spelled with h in Brāhmī, but Brāhmī rendered [γ] with h as well. In the DLT, however, where there was voice assimilation, both appear as ošxa-.

In TT X 459 and 481, čim+gar-u kör- becomes čingar- (spelled CYNGXRW) kör-, i.e. an alveolar nasal turns into a velar nasal:212 The place of articulation has shifted backwards under influence of the following velar.

In some words in some varieties of Old Turkic, /n/- becomes /m/ beside rounded vowels; Hamilton 1977 discusses a.o. kömül < kögil ‘heart’. OTWF 99 and 104 document the lexemes boymul < boyun+ and kömüldürük < kögül+ (which is also the source of Turkish gömlek ‘shirt’). Another instance is yürüm karak < yürü+ karak ‘the white of the eye’ in the Turkic-Khotanese hippological glossary (Wordlist 40).

2.409. The appearance of voiced stop allophones
Some scholars had thought that consonants in runiform inscriptions undergo progressive voice dissimilation such that voiced coda

---

211 Mark Kirchner has found exactly the same phenomenon in Kazakh.

212 The text writes čingar- but Peter Zieme has confirmed for me the reading presented here. This does not appear to happen elsewhere in published parts of the DKPAM, to which the TT X text belongs. DKPAM instances in U III 36,17 and 53,4; are misquoted in the footn. to TT X 459: In both places the edition has čingaru kör- but should have had čingaru kör-, as visible on the facs. This is also what appears in three other U III instances.
consonants were said to be followed by variants of suffixes starting with unvoiced consonants, whereas unvoiced coda consonants were said to be followed by variants of suffixes starting with voiced consonants. This view appears to have first been expressed in 1961 concerning the Tuñoqoq inscription by René Giraud, who edited this inscription. Tekin 1968: 100 speaks of ‘contact dissimilation’ in the Orkhon inscriptions in general, all his examples being cases where the letters \(d\) and \(g\) were replaced by \(t\) and \(k\) after /r l n/; the only ‘\(g > k\)’ examples he supplied were the words spelled \(ärkli\) ‘being’ and \(kulak\) ‘ear’. \(kulak\) is opaque and may never have had a /g/, leaving us with \(ärkli\). For alveolar contact Tekin (also Tekin 2000) has the suffixes of the constative preterite as well as +\(dA\), -\(dOk\) and -\(d\dagger\$\) whose \(D\) is replaced by \(T\).

Johanson 1979 argued against this view and has shown this not to have been the case at least as far as the alveolars are concerned. He states that the phenomenon is limited to the \(t\) runes which follow /r l n/ and sometimes /z/ where the suffix is otherwise spelled with a \(d\) rune; he makes it likely that this variation in spelling was sub-phonemic, \(t\) standing for the [d] allophone of /d/ whereas \(d\) is likely to have stood for the [\(θ\)] variant of this phoneme, which must have been the main allophone. His view in that domain has been adopted in section 2.32 above. Johanson’s hypothesis seems to be made likelier also by the existence of ligatures for /n/ + alveolar and /l/ + alveolar: These apparently reflected the fact that this alveolar was neither [t] nor [\(θ\)], the sound [d] in fact turning up only after /n l t/ (and partly /z/). Why there then was a ligature for /n/ + /\(θ\)/ and why the ligature /n/ + alveolar appears mostly in back-vowel words remains, however, unclear. The absence of a ligature for /l/ + alveolar can be explained by the fact that /\(d\)/ seems to have surfaced as [d] after /l/ only when it appeared at the

213 Clauson repeats Giraud’s statement on p. ix of the EDPT. T.Tekin 2000: 76-78 retains this description, with numerous examples from Orkhon and Yenisey Turkic and the IqB ms. for stems ending in /\(n r z m\)/. For velar contact he now gives, beside \(kulak\) and \(ärkli\), also ‘\(tamkalg\)’ from the Aćora (≈ E26 Yenisey) inscription. The word in question is interpreted as ‘\(t+m+ka\) ‘to my father’ by Kurt Wulff, which makes it regular since the dative suffix has a voiceless velar. We are thus left with \(är-ki\) as the only real example for velars.

214 The Orkhon inscriptions have more than 80 examples of the \(n/d\) ligature in back-vowel words, more than 25 sequences of \(n\) and \(t\) in front-vowel words and only 11 cases of the /n/ + alveolar sequence being spelled with the ligature in front-vowel words; there is not a single example of the sound sequence /n/ + alveolar spelled without ligature in back-vowel words anywhere in that whole corpus. The existence of the \(n\) ligature cannot be explained along the lines proposed by Johanson (possibly \(ant\) and \(an\) were ideograms).
beginning of verbal suffixes, the constative preterite, \(-dOk\) and \(-dAčI\), but hardly ever at the beginning of \(+dA\), \(+dAn\) / \(+dIn\) and the formative \(+dAm\); nominal suffixes generally do not replace \(d^1\) / \(d^2\) of their onset with \(t^1\) / \(t^2\).\(^{215}\) /\(r/ thus appears to have had an intermediary status. The realization of /\(d/ as \(b\) when appearing after vowels is further made likely by the spelling \(tos(u)k\) for what is clearly a form of the verb \(tod\) -‘to be satiated’ in KT S8 and BQ N6: This is no doubt to be understood as \(tos+\text{suk} < *\text{to}d+\text{suk}\). It is doubtful whether \(\text{ds}\) would have been assimilated in this way. What further emerges from the distribution of /\(d/ allophones after \(lt/\) in the suffix onset is that nominal juncture differs but not with the latter.

A similar phenomenon may have existed in the labial domain: The voiced fricative /\(v/ appears sometimes to have been realised as the stop [\(b\)] (spelled with pe in Uygur writing) beside /\(l/ and rarely /\(r/: e.g. in \(yubłunu\) (HT VI 1994; cf. OTWF 641) < \(yuvlu\)- ‘to roll about’, \(kǔbrǔ\) (BT III 947) < \(kǔvru\) ‘drum’ and \(yalbarńčǐ\) ‘inducing begging’ (BT XIII 29.8) < \(yalvar\)-; \(yalbar\)- is (beside \(yalvar\)-) common also in Suv (and survives as variant of \(yalvar\)- in Middle Turkic). Indirect evidence is Mongolian \(jilbi\) ~ Old Turkic \(yelvi\) ‘magic’ (cf. OTWF n.383). In Manichaean writing, which has a B distinct from P, we find e.g. \(yablak\) in TT II,2 22, \(nirban\) in Pothi 167. In that writing system, however, \(V\) is distinguished from \(B\) only by two diacritical dots above; since we have instances such as \(kɨb\) ‘fate’ (BT V 134) for what appears as \(kɨv\) everywhere else (e.g. three lines further on in the same text) or \(nizban\) in TT II,2 73 and 82 versus \(nizvan\) in l.20, it is highly likely that these dots were simply omitted.\(^{216}\) It might be that \(yablak\) (same text!) and \(nirban\) are similar cases of omission.

Johanson 1979: 7 does not deal with the two instances of the letter K after sonants which Tekin 1968: 100 mentions, stating that they are, as derivates, isolated and opaque. This is true of \(kulkak\)\(^{217}\) but not of the

\(^{215}\) The only such examples I have found in Orkhon Turkic are three instances spelled \(yerta\) (vs. four of \(yerd\)) in KT and BQ.

\(^{216}\) Thus already Zieme 1969: 35. Cf. also \(sabči\) for \(sao\) in Mahrmağ 33.

\(^{217}\) Tekin’s etymology for \(kulkak\) (deriving it from a Finno-Ugric verb) is unacceptable, and the one proposed in OTWF 75 is problematic as it involves a rare derivational suffix. The /\(k/ must be real, as it is also attested in the Brāhmī, Tibetan and Manichaean writing systems; a further Brāhmī example can be added from Maute 1996 text 3, l.113. ‘\(kulgak\)’ could have been taken to be the ultimate source if Oguz had been the only dialect group with the variant \(kulak\). \(kulak\) is, however, the general modern and Middle Turkic form, found also in languages which do not drop /\(g/ after consonants. \(kulak\) is, moreover, the general DLT and QB form, \(kulgak\) appearing in the latter when
word spelled ärkli. Johanson has consistently followed Schulz 1978 in reading this inscriptional word as ‘ärkāli’; still, e.g., in Johanson 2000, where he writes ‘ärk[ā]li’. I have, in section 3.282 below, tried to show that this view is groundless. Another suffix relevant for the discussion is -gXn. This suffix appears as -kXn explicitly in two Brāhmī instances, kätkin (TT VIII) and turkan (Maue 1996 21a 75; spelled with HK, which that text uses also for kīl- or kuš), and in two Qarakhanid lexemes, where it is spelled with qāf: barkān (‘a determined traveller’ thrice in the QB) and, again, turkān suv ‘quiet waters’ in the DLT. yadgun, todgun and tutgun are, on the other hand, Qarakhanid instances spelled with ghain, and the g did not appear in any other instance. The Qarakhanid examples are not conclusive by themselves, as Arabic ghain represents a fricative; qāf could well have been used for noting [g], a realisation of /q/ which exists in modern Arabic dialects and may well have existed already in Kāšgārī’s days. Taken together with the Brāhmī instances, however, the distribution seems significant: [k] after /l r/, [y] after other consonants. The formative -gOk / -gUk, dealt with in OTWF § 3.22, is spelled with K in tol-kok ‘inflatable skin container’ (qāf in the DLT) and yun-kuk ‘soap’ twice in Brāhmī writing, whereas instances where the suffix follows other consonants are spelled with G. -gl (OTWF § 3.110), finally, also appears as -kl with sonants: bur-kī ‘frowning; wrinkled (of face)’ has instances spelled with /k/ both in Arabic and Brāhmī writing, and yan-kī ‘recompense’ is in U II 77,24 spelled with double dotted X. After vowels and other consonants the suffix is well-established as -gl. In OTWF 321 I proposed to derive the particle ärki with this same suffix, while Röhrborn has proposed the form är-gāy as source (see section 3.34 below). The /k/ of ärki is documented in sources in Indic scripts; both etymologies would take this /k/ to be the realisation of a suffix normally appearing with /g/. The reason why -gAy itself does not show forms with K after bases ending in /l r/ can be that inflectional affixes in agglutinative languages tend to avoid irregular variations in shape; this might also be the reason demanded by the metre. Kāšgārī knows of kulak and kulxak as dialect forms. In view of all this there is no way to link the variants kulak and kulxak by any known synchronic or diachronic sound laws.

218 See section 3.282 for the participle suffix -(X)glI, with which the Orkhon Turkic conjunction spelled as ärkli is no doubt formed. While the productive forms of -(X)glI do not lose their onset vowel even when added to stems ending in /l r/, such loss is found in other suffixes (e.g. the -X- causative) and is probably an archaic feature.

219 Cf. the spellings būlay (twice) and adīlay in Xw 137-8 in Manichaean writing. bōšunyālī is also spelled with r in Xw. 187. Instances like kīlkārī with two dots over the
why, e.g., +dA does not become ‘+yA’ after vowels or voiced consonants in those modern languages which changed /ð/ to /ðl/. Spellings of d° or g° suffixes with t and k respectively after bases ending in /r l n/ can generally be read as having [d, g] as against [ð, ð] for the unmarked sound contexts, and the spellings ärkli and kulkak need not necessarily be counter-examples to Johanson’s theory: The k may represent a voiced stop as distinct from a fricative. Crucially, however, this interpretation is not obligatory, and a reading as [k] cannot be excluded; Especially in view of evidence from the Brāhmī writing system (where G does not imply fricativity) the replacement of /g/ by /k/ after /r l n/ appears really to have taken place: The reassignment to /k/ may well be historical fact, hinging on the possibility of assigning [g] to /g/ as well as to /k/ at some stage in the language’s history. Above I explained ärkli through the syllabification ärkli.

2.410. Onset devoicing
The formative -sXk- (discussed in section 3.212) is highly likely to have come from the formative sequence -(X)z-(X)k-; this would therefore be an instance of the sound change /z/ > /s/. One possible reason for the change may be that /z/ is not stable at the beginnings of suffixes (-zUn became -sUn from Qarakhanid on), or at the beginning of syllables in general (kavzat- is often spelled with s in Uygur, and cf. kabsa- attested at least thrice in the DLT), in view of its absence at the beginning of words. An early Manichaean text in fact has the shape utzux-, with z. Excluding Qarakhanid and looking at the Uygur instances of the suffix (listed in OTWF 700-704) we find that the bases of six of them, al-sïk-, kun-suk-, ar-sïk-, bil-sïk- and ur-suk-, end with the sonants /r l n/, three, tut-suk-, ut-suk- and yint-sik-, with /t/ and one, kuy-suk-, with /y/. It may also be this preponderance of the sonants, which exists at least in the documentation, which let /z/ be replaced by its voiceless counterpart /s/, as we find D replaced in these circumstances by T. ut-suk- is, after all, attested also with the earlier form with /z/. Concerning the other pairs of voiced and voiceless consonant letters discussed above, the rather convincing hypothesis was that what lies behind this opposition is in fact subphonemic [ð] vs. [d], an opposition not in voice but of continuant vs. stop. Such an opposition cannot have been relevant for /z sl/, however, as both are continuants. Assuming the correctness of the Johanson / Sims Williams / Doerfer hypothesis on

Q in ms. TM 42b (U 4795) of Suv 34k 14 are meaningless, as we find agir in the same line and oglî in v13 also spelled with dots over the Q.

220 Possibly to be read as kapsa-, where the [p] could have evolved from [f].
continuants vs. stops, we are therefore for these forms left with the explanation that /z/ was to be avoided at syllable onset.

2.411. Changes affecting /g/
In section 2.34 we saw that /g/ was pronounced as a fricative not only in back but also in front synharmonism. Fricative pronunciation explains the early loss of this velar in the variant äšäk of äšgäk ‘donkey’. The dropping of the velar took place earlier and much more massively in käräk ‘necessity’, as this is also a near-grammatical predicate signifying ‘it is necessary’: BuddhKat 37 (Tibetan writing) writes GA.RAG, although a g is spelled out in this position in a number of other words occurring in that text. In Brähmi writing, käräk occurs in three medical texts, but other Brähmi sources use käräk: TT VIII I has about eight instances and there are further ones in TT VIII M 18 and on 1.8 of text 23 in Maue 1996. Another instance of käräk occurs in a popular text about omens which also has four instances of käräk, in TT VII 28,54. Qarakhanid sources have hundreds of instances of käräk and not a single one of käräk, although the DLT mentions the base verb as käräk-. This latter fact shows that the reasons for this early loss of the velar were not only phonetic but also had to do with the function and frequency of käräk.221

Another indication that intervocalic /g/ tended to get pronounced like a glide in late texts can be found in the spelling igä of the word signifying ‘master’, which was also spelled iä (with graphic space between the two vowels). It seems likely that this comes from idi, which has the same meaning, although idi and igä occur together as binome in the 14th century inscription of CYK. igä would then be a hypercorrect spelling of iyä, which would be the result of a late change of intervocalic /d/ to /y/. The repeated appearance of üyür ‘(millet) seed’ as ügür in the DLT is a similar case of hypercorrect spelling: The documents of SammlUigKontr have the spellings üyür, üür, ür, ü’r and yür. This is apparently also what happens when Käšgari (fol. 504) says that bög is ‘more correct’ than böy for ‘poisonous spider’.

I have noted two early cases /g/ where is dropped from the sequence ‘üg+I’, in üülää- (Mait 84 v 24 = BT IX 209,24) from ütüg ‘flatiron’ and tütsüüg (TT V B 130 and 135) from tütsüg ‘incense’. These two instances, which could just be errors, are not an adequate base for generalization concerning coda position. In the DLT the desiderative

221 Presumably in order to explain the early appearance of käräk, Doerfer 1993: 30 takes käräk and käräk to be different derivates from one source; this is impossible, as there is no source in sight for käräk other than käräk, which comes from käräk-.
suffix -(X)gsA- becomes -(I)sA-; see OTWF 527 for details. This drop appears to have taken place in late Uyghur as well: There is no doubt that arvišig ... äšidsärläri tïŋlamišläri kärgäk (BT III 731) signifies ‘They need to wish to hear and to listen to the mantra’, that the first verb is the aorist participle of an -(X)sA- stem.222 Note also äkün in ChrManMsFr ManFr v 9 (an early Manichaean text), which may come from *äki+gü+n ‘two together’ if it is not an error but an elision of intervocalic /g/.223 In the very common nälük ‘to what purpose’, /AgU/ appears to have given /A/; assuming that this comes from the equally common nägülük.224 I take kerü ‘back(wards)’ and bärü ‘hither’ to come from *ke+gerü and *bä+gerü respectively, i.e. to have been contracted from original directives in +gArU.225

The spelling of kovuš ‘groove’ as koguš (see OTWF 421) is also ‘hypercorrect’, but is evidence of a process /g/ > /v/ beside rounded vowels. This process can be seen when kagrud- ‘to undergo mental torture’ alternates with kavrud-, the latter apparently turning up even several times in Mait; see OTWF 661. The verb köğädtür- ‘to praise, to embellish in words’ is, similarly, spelled as kövätdürüp in Suv 135,12. On the other hand the repeated appearance of äšgäk ‘donkey’ as äšyäk in the DLT shows a process /g/ > /y/ in fronted surroundings in that text.

2.412. Haplology

Haplology is found e.g. in orton < orto+dun, both ‘being in the middle’ (discussed among the +dXn nominals) and in kamagu < *kamag+agu, a collective expansion of kamag ‘all’. tiksiz < tik-ig+siz ‘unstung, unpricked’ in Suv 529,20 may not be an error in the strict sense, in that...

---

222 It is thus (against the editor’s statement in the footnote) of identical form as the Ottoman future. The Insaði (or better Avasadî) sütüras, after all, later than the DLT.

223 biz äkün, which can be read also as bizäkün as Z is never joined to the next letter, appears in HamTouHou 15,3, TugFrühText 10 (spelled with S), perhaps in BT V 675 and in I.22 of the Manichaean hymn edited in UAJb 16:221-2. Concerning HamTouHou it had been thought that this is another instance of äkün; the context makes it likelier that bizäkün was a place name, however, as proposed by Wilkens, the editor of the last mentioned source, following an oral suggestion of Röhrborn.

224 Examples in the EDPT and OTWF 122. A sound change AgU > A apparently took place also in the collective form bagiär found in several 13th-14th century texts, as documented in OTWF 82, and in equally late but Western bayat ‘God’, probably < bayagıt ‘well-to-do gentleman’. Other interrogative phrases which were reduced to two syllables are nārök < nācā ök, nāgük < nāgü ök and the DLT’s nārak < nā kārak (and cf. Turkish nıçin ‘why; what for’ < ne için and nıçal ‘how’ < ne ad).
it was presumably pronounced that way: Cf. yıglığ apparently for *yıg-
ıglığ in Abhi B 1404. In an instance like bo yarlıg eşidip (KP 18,8)
‘having heard this order’ yarlıg could have been simplified from
accusative yarlıg+ıg.

/VrVr/ is quite susceptible to syncopation: In aorist forms of stems
ending in *ur- in BuddhKat, algyaddurlar comes from algyad-dur-ur+lar
and olur comes from olor-ur. Similarly öŋätür in Heilk I 14, which
signifies ‘it cures’ and must come from *öŋ+üd-tür-ur. The Brāhmī ms.
TT VIII L has forms such as tükärmäsär < *tükä-r är-mä-sär (12-13
and 21) and tersär < *te-r är-sär (33). ärkän, which is used as a
temporal conjunction, may possibly be the result of syncopation from
*ärür kän, with a particle described in section 4.633 as being added to
temporal adverbs (and cf. the temporal suffix -mAžkAn).

The DLT distinguishes between kisi ‘wife’ and kiši ‘person’; this
distinction has by the EDPT and by Zieme in TDAYB 1987:306-7 been
taken to hold for Uygur as well. Since such a distinction is found
neither in runiform sources nor in any modern language and is at least
not explicit in Uygur,226 I take kisi to come from kiši+sि: ‘wife’ is an
inalienable term, from the group with which the possessive suffix often
becomes part of the stem. Concerning Uygur, then, kiši could have
signified both ‘person’ and ‘wife’, or the meaning ‘wife’ could have
been borne by kisi. Verb / noun homophones ending in /š/ may all have
been caused by haplology, as no example of the formation in -Xš
derived from such verb stems appears to have survived: Qarakhanid tuš
‘place or time of a halt’ (hence sometimes ‘midday’) ought to come
from *tuš-uš, from the verb signifying ‘get down (from a horse)’, tuš in
the phrase tuš tulum bol- ‘to meet’ from tuš-, same meaning, over tuš-
uš,227 toš ‘water reservoir, pool’, partly documented in the EDPT, <
*toš-uš, from to-š- ‘to fill up’, sïš ‘a swelling’ from *sïš-iš (both noun
and verb listed in the EDPT), koš ‘a pair’ from koš- ‘to conjoin’.
bagdaš ‘sitting with legs crossed’ is likelier to have come from *bagda-
š-iš than from *bagda-š, as bagda- (found only in Qarakhanid) signifies

226 Cf. the n. to BuddhKat l. 4. In Uygur script /š/ is practically always spelled as s.
227 tušuš is, I think, attested in ašuš tuaštānta (U III 6,2, and DPAMPb 741, the same
passage in two mss.) ‘in front of (or opposite) the tent’ and in anuš tuaštānta ‘in front of
( or opposite) that (i.e. an orchard)’ in 1.12 of the Udayana fragments of the same text
published by Wilkens in SIAl 18(2003): 155. I don’t think the instances should be
emended away to tuaštānta as proposed in EDPT 129b and UW 91a; nor do I think it
possible to analyse the word as tuašvì-sín+tu with double use of the possessive suffix, as
proposed by the editors of DKPAMPb, although the word is spelled with Y in the
second syllable in that ms.: The other two mss. have W, and their proposal would entail
too much of an exception.
Haplology can always take place when consonants and vowels in two adjacent syllables share most phonetic features; orto+dun could actually also have been pronounced as ortodon and olor-ur as oloror.

2.413. Word fusion
In several different situations, word sequences become single prosodic units. Some noun phrases becoming lexical units are discussed in the beginning of section 4.12. Binomes, dealt with in part VI, are a special type of fixed collocations. Such close juncture can have phonetical results: ini eči(lär) ‘younger and elder brothers’ becomes in’eči(lär), e.g. in ManBuchFr 1,1 r 4, in M III Nr.8 VII v 10 and in Yenisey inscriptions. In this case, adjacent vowels of the two lexemes are involved, resulting in elision or crasis. Even occasional extensive contractions, such as bitur ‘last year’ (HTs VII 1912) < bir yil turur ‘it is one year’ cannot be wholly ruled out. We sometimes get linked spelling as in ātūz also with the particle Ok, which usually, but not always, drops its vowel if the word it is added to has a vowel coda: For instance with olırtäči-k in Tuň 11. This clitic can be repeated, (O)k Ok then giving kOk in Orkhon Turkic. The variant kOk lives on in South Siberian Turkic to this day. Beside anta ok and antak we get "NT"WX, where the two words are just spelled without space in between, but with an alef before the o. Cf. also, e.g., yerintäöök in MaitH X 6a12, wrongly read as ‘yirintänök’.

ol becomes a clitic and loses its onset vowel in a few set phrases in which it is used as copula: We find kayul ‘which one is it?’ < kayu ol a number of times in the catechism in Tibetan script. nāğül < nā+gü ol ‘what (collective) is?’ appears e.g. HTs VIII 388 and 398 in the phrases nāğül öνäs and adırri nāğül ‘What is the difference?'; there are a number of examples elsewhere in Hts; also in Tattvärtäh, mainly in the phrase iši nāğül ‘what is its business?’. The same phonetic process happens in -gUl < -gU ol, which, in late texts, becomes a suffix of impersonal mood meaning ‘one should ...’ (see section 5.2).

Cf. further the crasis of nā ārgāy to nārgāy ‘what will become of ...’ twice in a runiform inscription (YE 41,8; cf. OTWF 301), involving fusion between the interrogative pronoun and the copula; similarly nāzā ‘thing’ < nā āršār ‘whatever’ four times in a late contract (Mi19 in SammsUigKontr). Kašgari (fol. 197) states that nārāk ‘Why is it necessary?’ (spelled without alif – or indeed any explicit vowel – in the

Additional possible examples for haplology in connection with this formation are mentioned in OTWF 265.
first syllable, showing that the vowel was short) comes from nā käräk; the strong stress on ‘Why?’ here even led to the dropping of /k/.

Further inscriptive fusions with pronoun vowels occur in bödkä (KT S11, BQ N1 and 8 and E2) ‘at this time’ < bo üdkä, attested in K S 1 and bučögü < bo üčögü ‘these three’ in Tuñ 12: Note that the second (front) vowel prevails in bödkä, the first, back one in bučögü. Backward fronting, again involving bo (though without syllable loss), takes place also in bökö̞n ‘today’ < bo kün ‘this day’. It appears in bökö̞n bar yaran yok ‘here today and gone tomorrow’ (Mait Taf.118r12 = MaitH Y 12b27, colophon reedited by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133) and in bögüŋkätägi ‘till today’ in ManTüFr 7 and BT V 148. This word is spelled thus with G in Manichaean script in both mss.; this could be a case of voice confusion in the BT V text, which has another two instances for this phenomenon, but not in ManTüFr, which does not, and on the other hand has kanyu as a sign of archaicty. Since Old Turkic consonants do not get voiced between vowels, this should mean that an original *gün (with ã in all Oguz languages) was here retained because it was not in onset position: This fusion would have come about before *g° > *k°.

kim+kä nä (pronoun and negative particle) is contracted to kimkä in DreiPrinz 71 (and, damaged, in 86); there is a similar contraction in Orkhon Turkic. The postposition täg fused with the demonstrative pronouns bun+ and an+ by adapting to back harmony, giving montag and antag, sizintäg (instead of sizni täg) ‘like you’ in ChrManMsFr ManFr r 10 and bintägi ‘someone like me’ in Tuñ 57 (before AlyÖm 2000: 110-111 erroneously read as ‘biintägi’ and since T. Tekin 1963 interpreted as a case of backward assimilation) are additional instances showing that täg was on the way to becoming a case suffix. The process appears not to have been quite complete in Orkhon Turkic, however, as we also find an instance of antäg (Tuñ 29), where the postposition still retains its vowel.

In the verbal domain we get fusion between the vowel of the verb and the onset vowels of auxiliaries following them. This happens in Orkhon Turkic with the verb üd- (described in section 3.251), in xaganin ıçgīn ıdımiš ‘quite lost their ruler’ in Ongin F 2 and ança (ajy(i) ıdımiš ‘sent the following message’ in Tuñ 34: Had there been no factual fusion, the converbs would have had the shapes ıçıgu and au.229 In Uygur the phenomenon is widespread with the verb u- ‘to

229 Tekin 1968: 101 (§2.259, 2°) read this as ‘ança ıdımi’s’ and took it to be an instance of external hiatus filled by a helping consonant; this was argued against in
be able to’ (described in section 3.253). The examples I have come across all involve the negative form uma-; the fusion therefore appears to have moved towards the creation of an impossibility form, which is a reality at least since Qarakhanid Turkic. In Manichæan sources we have e.g. baru uma- (Xw 75), tutu uma- (Xw 216), uku uma- (ms. U 232 quoted in Zieme 1969: 20), särü uma- (M I 16,20), särü uma- (M III Nr.18, 36,8); in Buddhist sources ädikü uma- (TT V B 118), tutu uma- (U III 66,15), īdu uma- (KP 27,3), särü uma- a number of times in the DKPAM. The vowels of these converbs would have the shapes -I or -A if they were not being employed in this construction. This assimilation does not yet take place in runiform sources, which have artaï ù- (BQ E19) and mça uma- (IrqB LXI). Practically all of Uygur has it but it is prevented by the parallelism of biverbs, e.g. īya basa umädïn (TT II,2 74), ara yuva umadïlar (Mait Taf 202r12) or īlDa uka ugaylar (Mait Taf 26v8). īda um[a]dïn has been read in Mait Taf 72v22.230

2.5. Morphophonology

2.5.1. Native stems

The phonotactic compatibility of stems and suffixes demands suffix allomorphs, one set starting with a consonant, another with a vowel, to suit bases ending in vowel or consonant respectively. Thus there is a present participle suffix with the variants -igmä, -īgma, -ügmä, -ugma after consonants, -gmä, -gma after vowels, for which we have the morphophonemic notation -(X)gmA; the X symbolises a whole set of vowels: /i ï u ü, also /o ö/ and perhaps others (see below). It is incorrect to give ‘-gmA’ as morphophonemic notation (as most recently done by Tekin 2000: 17), and write käl-igmä “gelen” etc. as if there were a helping vowel -i- between the stem and the suffix, because the identity of this vowel cannot be predicted from the phonetic surroundings: The unstable vowel is e.g. /a ù/ in the formative +(A)r- or the collective suffix +(A)gU or the volitional suffix -(A)Im, /o ö/ in the suffix -(O)k forming deverbal nouns. The choice between /X/, /A/ (standing for a or ä) or /Ø/ (standing for o or ö) depends on the suffix, which means that these vowels (whose appearance is steered by phonotactics) are part of the suffix.

Erdal 1979b: 224 (n.30). Hiatus-bridging /y/ is a phenomenon peculiar to the Oguz branch and is unknown in Old Turkic.

230 The editor states the remaining letters of the second word to be unclear but nothing else would probably suit the context.
Rarely, suffixes starting with a vowel retain this vowel in all positions, in which case bases ending in a vowel elide theirs: \(+\text{U}\)t, which expresses plurality with titles, appears e.g. in \textit{tarkat, sä}ünst and \textit{tegit}, the plurals of the titles \textit{tarkan, sä}yün and \textit{tegin}; it may have been borrowed together with these bases, possibly from a Mongolic language. Suffixes which thus replace a part of their base are called dominant. Dominance (first described for Turkic in Erdal 1979a) never applies to single-syllable vowel bases, as it would change them beyond recognition. It is also found with the suffixes \(-\text{Xš}\) and \(-\text{Xn}\) and one or two others.

A few of the suffixes starting with consonants drop these when added to stems ending with consonants: The 3rd person possessive suffix \(+\text{(s)}\l(n)\) drops its /s/ when the stem has a consonant at its end, the ordinal suffix \(+\text{(r)}\Ar\) drops its /r/, the genitive suffix of the runiform sources and a few Manichaean mss. \(+\text{(n)}\xxt\) its /n/. Morpheme juncture is dealt with in greater detail in Erdal 1979a.

Synharmonism has been presented above in terms of phonemes alternating in an archphoneme framework as far as vowels are concerned but (seemingly inconsistently) as a matter of allophones in the consonantal domain; this has to do with the fact that the distinctions are, in practically all Turkic languages, salient for all vowels but only for a few of the consonants. Strictly speaking, syllables are affected by fronting and, in principle, even by rounding as wholes: Note that the runiform script has quite different front and back characters for most consonants (but not for all vowels); for the voiceless stops it even uses special characters depending on whether vowels before or after them are rounded or not. We have substantial evidence that Old Turkic /k/ was pronounced rather differently in front and in back surroundings.

We here give a classification of suffixes by archphoneme vowels. Vowels in brackets are dropped if the phoneme stretch preceding the suffix ends in a vowel (or in /\text{s}/ when the resulting cluster is admitted).

Suffixes containing the archphoneme /A/ are: \(+\text{ČA}, +\text{dA}, +\text{kA}, +\text{gArU}, +\text{RA}/\text{yA}, +\text{tAr}, +\text{dAm}, +\text{AgUt}, +\text{(A)}\gU, +\text{klA}, +\text{(A)n}\); the postposition \(\text{yAn}; +\text{(A)d-}, +\text{(A)r-}, +\text{A-}, +\text{Ia-}, +\text{(X)rKA-}, +\text{sIra-}; -\text{(A)yIn}, -\text{(A)Ilm}, -\text{Ar}\) (durative aspect suffix), \(-\text{mA}, -\text{mA}, -\text{(X)gmA}, -\text{gAк}, -\text{gA}, -\text{A}\) (converb), \(-\text{gAIl}, -\text{mAIl(n)}, -\text{gAn}, -\text{gAk}, -\text{mA}, -\text{(X)pAn}, -\text{gAysOk / -gAšOk}; -\text{Ar}, -\text{mA-}\).

Suffixes with /U/: \(+\text{gArU}, +\text{dUrXk}, +\text{lXgU}, +\text{AgUt}, +\text{(A)}\gU; +\text{U-}; -\text{yU}, -\text{U}\) (converb suffixes), \(-\text{(X)nAčU}, -\text{Ur}, -\text{yUr}\) (aorist suffixes), \(-\text{gU}\) and \(-\text{gULXk}, -\text{zUn}; -\text{tUr}, -\text{Ur-}\) (and cf. enclitic \(\text{mU}\)). The second and third syllable of \textit{altun} ‘gold’ and \textit{küdägü} ‘bridegroom’ could be said to embody the archphoneme /\text{U}/ in that /\text{U}/ would be realised as /u/ in one
case, as /ül/ in the other. The distinction between high and low rounded vowels is directly documented in texts written in Indic scripts.

Suffixes with /ö/, /ü/: +SOk; -(O)k; -gOk, -yOk, -dOk, and -gÁšOk; similarly the enclitic particle (O)k. Evidence for the vowel in different suffixes will be given in the next chapter, where we deal with their morphology. All the suffixes mentioned end with /k/; since the archphoneme /U/ is in no suffix followed by coda /k/, we get complementary distribution: /U/ /Ü/ /Ý/.[231]

Evidence for the vowel in the different suffixes will be given in the next chapter, where we deal with their morphology. All the suffixes mentioned end with /k/; since the archphoneme /U/ is in no suffix followed by coda /k/, we get complementary distribution: /U/ /Ü/ /Ý/.[231] These instances come from underlying /u/ ü/. If, on the other hand, the syllable preceding this process contains the vowels /u/ or /ü/, the suffix vowel can appear either with /o/ ö/ or with /u/ ü/; cf. üzüksüz (BuddhKat 31, Tibetan script) and buyruk (Khotanese Brāhmī) with explicit /u/ ü/ in the second syllable. In examples mentioned in section 2,401, /o/ and /ö/ in common contexts are likely to be replacements for /a/ ä/ or /u/ ü/ when the preceding syllable has /o/ ö/; /X/ is also likely to have given [o/ ö/] when preceded by /o/ ö/. These are instances of strict vowel attraction; what influence /k/ may have had on the vowels is not, however, evident in any way. High rounded vowels before coda /k/ could be lowered in stems as well, if the Harezm-Turkic appearance of sü for `bone' (Ata 2002: 50) is any indication; in Old Turkic the second syllable of this lexeme is always rounded, and this form would signify that the Old Turkic lexeme is to be read as süök.

Suffixes with /X/: +XZ, +(X)g, +(X)n, +sXZ, [232] +lXg, +lXgU, +lXk, +(X)m, +(X)n, +(n)Xn, +dXn, +(X)t, +dUrXk; +(X)k-, +(X)rKA--; gULIXk, -Xš, -(X)nč, -(X)nčIg, -(X)nčU, -(X)m, -gXn, -(X)z, -(X)ŋ, -(X)l, -sXk, -(X)gmA, -(X)glI, -pAn, -(X)yXn; -(X)t-, -(X)k-, -(X)z-, -(X)l-, -(X)gmA, -(X)glI, -(X)l, -(X)gI, -(X)m, -(X)IñA, -lI, -Il; -(A)Im, -(I) (deverbal noun), -(Ir) (aorist suffix with -(X)t- etc.), -(X)gI, gI (imperative particle), -gAll, -(X)nčIg and -vI. The suffixes +(s)I(n), +sIrA and -(A)yIn are, in the Orkhon inscriptions, usually spelled with s2 and n2; the instances are mentioned in T. Tekin.

231 /ül/ and /ül/ are, however, followed by /k/ without their vowels getting realised as /o/ ö/ if they belong to the archphoneme /X/.

232 This suffix may originally have had /l/: A denominal verb formative derived from it (documented in the OTWF) has the shape +sIrA-, the Tuñ inscription spells the suffix once as s2 and once as s2n2 (in the instrumental case) in two instances following rounded back vowels, and the Yenisey inscription E26 twice writes b′w激烈 `without shortage'. These are exceptions (IrqB 45 has explicit otšuš svasuš `without grass or water', e.g.) but they are early. Bang 1925: 40 thought that the suffix could originally have been an -(X)z- derive from st- `to break', which would fit with these facts; but the transition from /ül/ to /ül/ would still have to be explained.
1968: 59. cf. also *katā+i+di* with d$^1$ in KT N 2. The inscriptions of the Uygur kaganate, on the other hand, show a different picture: *(A)yIn is spelled with n$^1$ in both of its ŠU exs., and the spelling of -miš in Tariat appears to fluctuate between s$^1$ and s$^2$. The Orkhon Turkic spelling of *suv+i+gari+ with r$^1$ and w (not ū) in BQ E40$^{233}$ or consistent Uygur spelling of -miš+ka with the letter X in Uygur writing, with double dotted K or Q in Manichæan writing all together add up to show that the fronting was subphonemic. Note also that KT S9 and BQ N 7 spell *alsa+i+n* with t$^1$ and not t$^2$. The instrumental suffix +*(X)n could, in Uygur runiform inscriptions, be spelled with n$^2$ which, on the other hand, always write +(s)In with n$^1$ (e.g. in atimên in Tariat E4, kanîn S1), sometimes with explicit I.

Johanson 2001: 1726a makes the following surprising statement: ‘Suffixe sind am Anfang ihrer Entwicklung unharmonisch, invariabel. Im Ost-Alttürkischen$^{234}$ war z.B, das Dativsuffix +*qa ein hinteres Suffix, während das Possessivsuffix -(s)i ein vorderes Suffix war. Das erste uns bekannte Türkisch weist also viele disharmonische Wortformen auf.’” The dative suffix (see below in section 3.124) always follows synharmonism,$^{235}$ however, and the unharmonic realisations of +(s)i(n+) as consistently front are clearly subphonemic. In section 3.122 we discuss the possibility that +(s)i(n+) and +(i)n+ were originally independent pronouns (with back vowels): They may possibly have become suffixes secondarily; this is not something one can (or should) say about any other Old Turkic suffix. Johanson’s last quoted sentence is quite misguided as far as Turkic words are concerned; we will see in section 2.52 below that he is right concerning lexemes copied from Indo-European languages – but those are unlikely to have been on his mind. The passage gives the impression that synharmonism is something which developed gradually during the history of Old Turkic – this is misguided.

It is an entirely different (and marginal) matter that the consonant cluster /ň/ appears to front the stretch of the word following it. We find that in *koňčilarkâ* in a runiform ms. (Miran c 5)$^{236}$ and in *innelâri* in

---

$^{233}$ See section 3.122 below.

$^{234}$ I.e. the language described here.

$^{235}$ The only possible (though by Johanson unmentioned) reason for this view of the dative suffix is the dative *ba* and *sa* of the personal pronouns *ba*‘I’ and *sən* ‘you’.

$^{236}$ This instance from Dunhuang does not justify the reading of all Orkhon Turkic instances of +*či* as +*či*, as done in Tekin 1968: 62-63. There is a punctuation mark between *koňča* or *koňča* and *tīl*k*1*A; either this mark is an error, or what comes after it should be emended to *r*1*k*2*A or *gir+kâ*. The text says that one set of armour is allotted to this/these person(s). *r*mk*čes*n* = *armakêis*in in KT E6 and *y*1*g*1*we*1* = *aygwe*1* in
In the second instance the cluster is also actually spelled ṇc. This is not at all the situation described above, where the syllables in question appear to be fronted (or at least neutral) sub-phonemically, without influencing subsequent syllables.

The texts are not free from irregularities in synharmonism as far as rounding in Turkic words is concerned, but these are not common. Examples are kat+ũṳ̄+garu ‘to your honour’ (M III Nr.9 VII r1), ăgăũ+l+ig (MaitH X 1r16) or ōt+ım+in ‘my advice (acc.’) (U IV D 42). There is a list of such irregularities in Manichaean sources in Zieme 1969: 57, with examples from Buddhist texts added in the note 309 thereto. With binomes such as ăgrũnũ+c+lig+in sâvinũ+l+ig+in (MaitH XX 1r7) or mũn+sũz kadag+sũz (M III Nr.22 v1) the irregularity is caused by parallelism, apparently visual parallelism in the second case. In a few instances, /I/ is replaced by /X/ within stems, as toyunlar < toyũnlar (Saddh 36) ‘monks’, üšůt- ‘to chill’ < üši-t- (Ernte 24 and Ernte II 2) or kuru- < kuri- ‘to dry’ (Ernte 119).

Doerfer 1981: 55 has noted that there are no suffixes with coda /X/, whereas /A I U/ are well attested in this position; nor is there any coda /O/ in suffixes, but this follows from the fact that the choice for /O/ over /U/ in non-first syllables is directly related to the vowel’s being followed by /k/. This special situation of /X/ demands an explanation, and the two possible ones have already been suggested.

Note also that we have found no suffixes in which onset /I/ or /U/ get dropped after vowels; this appears to happen only to onset /O/, /X/ and /A/. The vowel of the aorist suffix,237 which has various allomorphs, is lexically determined: We find -Ar with most simple stems, most denominal ones and some derived ones, -Ur with most derived stems and a few simple ones, -Ir with causative stems ending in -(X)t-. With (derived and simple) stems ending in vowels the most common variant is -yUr, -yUr alternates with -r (e.g. the numerous instances of te-r ,it says’ in the IrqB), which could, in principle, come both from -Ar and from -Ur by the dropping of the vowel: -Ur might seem to be the likelier source if one thinks of -yUr as letting the hiatus-bridging /y/ precede the allomorph -Ur – but there is no hiatus-bridging /y/ in Old Turkic;238 -Ar seems a likelier source since practically all verb stems

---

Tuñ 49 do not speak for Tekin’s view on +čI either, as +č(s)Il(n), the suffix spelled with s², does so also when not preceded by +čI.

237 Discussed in section 3.233 below.

238 Tekin 2000: 79 makes this phenomenon responsible for the /y/ in the suffix +yA. That, however, should be an allomorph of the directive/locative case suffix +rA; cf.
ending in vowels are either simple or denominal. One could then write this particular realisation of the suffix as -(A)r. For this same reason, -yUr does not come from -Ur through the addition of /yl/, but is an allomorph by itself. +(I)cAk, an element expressing endearment, may possibly be the only suffix which does drop an onset /l/; see section 3.111. It was probably borrowed from Iranian, however, and evidence for it is quite tenuous.

-(O)k drops its onset vowel also in kör-k, 'beauty' < kör-, 'to see', ör-k 'prominent' < ör- 'to rise' and tur-k 'length, height' (discussed in OTWF 224-225), since the cluster /rk/ is admitted. This clearly does not happen to -(X)g, since we have sor-ug, sūr-ūg, tur-ug, ur-ug and yör-ūg. -(U)t behaves in the same way, with adīrt and its synonym and binome-mate ūdīr-t (both under adīrt in the UW), āgīr-t 'siege', ur-t 'eye of a needle' < ur- 'put, place' and also yurt 'encampment' < Khaladj yuOr-, 'to sit or stay at some place'. ör-t, ber-t and kīrt are formed in a similar way. The causative suffix -(X)t- / -(I)t- equally drops its vowel after /l/, in adart-, agart-, bākūrt-, bālgūrt-, bīštūrt- and so forth; the examples are quite numerous. The formative +(X)k-, on the other hand, retains its vowel after /l/ and /r/, as can be seen, a.o., from yol+uk- 'to come across' and the very common bir+iik- 'to come together'. The much less common -(X)k- fluctuates: Besides the many examples of tar-iik- 'to disperse (intr.)' we find in two pre-classical texts (BT V 494 and Mait 165v28) the form tark-. The single Uygur counterpart of Qarakhanid balīk- 'to get wounded' (related to baš 'wound' and balīg 'wounded') attested in Xw 74 is balk-. We cannot say that these vowels were dropped because they belong to an affix; they could also have disappeared due to the (more general) process of the loss of the medial vowels: Note elit- 'to lead' and its common variant elt-. -(X)p does not lose its onset vowel even after /l/, although /rp/ is an admitted coda cluster: Dropping the vowel would contradict the tendency of having at least one syllable for each inflectional affix. This may originally have been different, taking tolp 'all' to be a petrified -(X)p convert from tol- 'to get full'; but the syncopation could also have developed secondarily, when the word was no longer felt to be a verb. As far as inflectional morphology is concerned, stem-final /l/ behaves like a consonant with respect to the dropping of vowels in morpheme juncture; with stem-final /l/ and /h/ this is true also of word formation.

section 3.124 below. 'yu-y-ul-' in 1.1 of the text edited on p.300 of Laut & Ölmez 1998 should better be read as yuv-ul-, mentioned as a possible reading in the note thereto.
The emphatic clitic Ok, the interrogative particle mU and the rhetorical particle gU of the Orkhon inscriptions follow synharmonism. In Orkhon Turkic, the postpositions yan ‘in the direction of’ (originally a noun signifying ‘side’) and tāg ‘like’ turn into yAn and tAg, thus assimilating to case status; the former with nouns, the latter in montag and antag, hintāgi and sizintāg, from the oblique stems of bo ‘this’ and ol ‘that’, bān ‘I’ and siz ‘you (pl.)’ respectively. This process, which results in morphologization, is limited to Orkhon Turkic as far as yan is concerned, but is, with tāg, carried on in Uygur. The phrase nā tāg ‘like what’, also often spelled without space between the two syllables, must have undergone the same process: In nātāg+lā+ti (Suv) the phrase is expanded with two suffixes of adverb formation.

2.52. Borrowed stems

The morphophonology of borrowed elements has recently been dealt with in Erdal 2002. Borrowed stems normally get suffixes in back variants also when they have front vowels, in violation of synharmonism rules. This fact, first pointed out in Zieme 1969: 37-8 and elaborated upon by Röhrborn 1988 and 1996, is best observed in texts written in Brāhmī script, which has special spellings for all front vowels; e.g., asanke+larta (Maue 1996, 19 Nr.11), šarmire+lari and šarmire+larka (Maue 1996, 3 Nrs.78 and 84) or tette+lariniš (ĀtŚū 1 v4). ĕl, the only vowel for which Brāhmī mss. do not have a special character, is generally spelled like ĕl.239 Where most Brāhmī mss. write ī in the pre-suffix syllable, this can be read as [i] as well. Instances such as ništani+lari (in Maue 1996 Nr. 44b B2), rāši+ta (TT VIII L32), jñātārī+i+līglar (TT VIII G13), kumbandi+lar (ĀtŚū 1 v6) or gandarvi+lar (in ĀtŚū 3 r2 and v1) and even indri+lar (in ĀtŚū 1 r3) are no corroboration of the rule, as their ĭ could in fact be ī. The pronunciation hidden behind rsi+larda in TT VIII D6 and arži+ka ‘to the rši’ in BT VIII A 87 was probably arži with ī, because it is twice spelled with e in the second syllable in BuddhKat.240 nīzvani+līg (TT VIII E47; also often in Mait etc.) is likely to have been pronounced with ĕl for the same reason: We find nīzvani (of Sogdian origin) 4

239 Only the ms. TT VIII I differs here in writing ĕl (as well as ĕ) as E whereas the letter E in other Brāhmī mss. exclusively represents the vowel ĕ. In both Turkic and borrowed words. In this it shows exactly the same practice as BuddhKat, which is in Tibetan writing.

240 See the previous footnote. ĕl is not to be expected in this word, as the Skt. source has ĕl and not ĕl. See Erdal 2002: 20 for its first vowel.
times spelled with *e* in the third syllable in BuddhKat. For texts written in Semitic scripts we can know of the harmony class of a suffix only when it contains the letter *X*.\(^{241}\) Consistent back suffix harmony in foreign elements can then be proven either when a stem shows explicit front spelling or when it is otherwise attested in an Indian writing system. A very clear such instance is *çärnì+ka* (HeilkII 1.48), whose first vowel is spelled as *WY*. The reading of *asanke+lig* (Mait 90v9 and 192v3, Suv 163.17, TT X 2 etc.) and *asanke+daki* (DKPAMPb 263, 403) would also be undisputed, as we have this stem also in Brāhmī. Similarly with *den+ka* , ‘to the religion’ (TT II.1 46), whose base is attested with front vowels in Tibetan script in BuddhKat 26, 29 and 30. In other cases with back harmony in the suffix it is not sure that the base has front vowels even if the word in the source language does. Counter-examples to the rule are rare; such are *šarir+kā* ‘to the relic’ (MaitH Y 118) and *frišti+lār+kā* (M III Nr.1 I v3 and elsewhere); in the case of *frišti* ‘angel’ back-harmony suffixation is attested as well (M II 10.4, TT IX 94 and elsewhere).

In a case like *darnì+g* ‘the spell (acc.)’ (Suv 484,17) the second vowel may actually have been transferred into the back class by the *X* of the accusative suffix (with which it shares the syllable) and become *ɦl/.*

The second vowel in *v(a)žìr+lig* (< Skt. *vajra*; TT V A41, suffix spelled with *X*) was introduced secondarily, and there is no reason to think that it did not follow synharmonism. Similarly *čakìr* < Skt. *cakra* ‘wheel’, *bhavãr* < *bhañvara* (discussed in OTWF 16) or *čànkìmit* in TT X 513 (though spelled with *K* and not *X*) alternating with *čànkràmit* in l. 518, whose Sanskrit original did not have any vowel before the *ṅl/\(\)e* either. The third vowel of this word could also, of course, have been *ṅl/\(\)e*, though we have no way of knowing. The fact that the last three words are spelled with *K* and not *X* is irrelevant for the vowel; as pointed out in section 2.34, velar stops in borrowings are not spelled with *X* even when appearing in back-harmony syllables.

Hence the base of a form like *šàki+lig+lar* (ShôAgon 3.22; < Skt. *śākyà*) could also, influenced by its first vowel, have ended in *ṅl/\(\)e* in spite of the spelling with front *K*. Similarly *čàdïkìlig* (e.g. TT X 4) also spelled with *K*, originally from Skt. *jānaka*; the raising of the second vowel would indicate Sogdian origin. *užìk* ‘letter’ is likely to have had an *ṅl/\(\)e* and not an *ṅl/\(\)e* as second vowel in spite of the spelling with *K*

---

\(^{241}\) The difference between the so-called ‘signal letters’ is not reflected in our transcription; we write front or back vowels instead, though this cannot be seen in the ms. if it does not use an Indic writing system.
because a common variant is, in Semitic script, spelled with *alef* instead of *yod* in the second syllable.

It also happened, on the other hand, that borrowed stems were fronted through the presence of *K*, possibly by spelling pronunciation. Such cases are *kūzāl* ‘nice’ ≪ *Skt. kuśala*, *sāṝṇām* ‘monastery’ ≪ *Skt. sanghārāma* ‘monastery’ and *Gōdām* ≪ *Gautama*. *g(ā)r+āk* ‘at (the ascendance of) the planet’ (Sanskrit *grāha*) has been read in a Berlin fragment of Suv by Le Coq (the fragment itself is now lost); the onset *K* apparently caused the fronting.

Bases with back synharmonism practically never get front suffixes: Note runiform *nāg₁ws₁k₁l₁r₁* = *nagošaklär* ‘lay believers’ in ms. TM 332 (KöktüTurf p.1047): The word is spelled with a front *k* but the plural suffix is *+lär* and not *+lār*. When the base ends with a *caph* (in Turkic units used only beside front vowels), suffix velars adjacent to it can also be spelled with *caph* e.g. in *n(a)xistak+*(*k)a* (with velar simplification) or *možag+*ka* (M I 33,18; ManBuchFr 1v6). This spelling practice does not imply reading *možag+kā*, as Zieme 1969: 57 did: The runiform spelling of *nagošaklär* shows that the vowels were not fronted. There are counter-examples to this spelling rule as well, e.g *saš*+ka (BT XIII 13,81 in two mss.) and *abišik+liģ* with *X* in the suffix. There is actually quite a lot of fluctuation after coda *Ks* of the stem; the Uygur counterpart of *Skt. śloka* ‘verse’ is often spelled with front suffixes but we also have the accusative *šlok+ug* with *X* in Ht VIII 1924.

Counter-examples where foreign back-vowel words not ending in *K* are followed by front-vowel suffixes are exceedingly rare. If they are errors, as Röhborn 1996: 178 (who mentions one of the examples) thinks, they undermine the trustworthiness of Brähmi evidence for the rule Röhborn was trying to establish in that paper. Two other such instances are *ugur+dā* in Maue 1996: 3 Nrs. 90 and 96, a few lines from the instance *rajagır+dā* which Röhborn is there discussing (3 Nr. 86).

---

242 Mz 386 (TM 333) v1-2 was read as *śl’k’l’r’w[i]r’t’r’l* by P.Zieme in ‘A Manichäan-Turkic dispute in runic script’ (2001), interpreted as *[nigoʃaklär t[u]g][ar ārī]* and translated as ‘[audi]tors were born’. This would mean that *nigoʃak* here gets the front variant of the plural suffix. The first character does not at all look like *s*, however, but rather like *k*, and the verb phrase *tugar ārī* would imply durative aspect or a continuous or iterative event, which seems unlikely; besides, babies are not born as auditors. Another possible reading is *j[ka k][ał][i]r[ t[u]s][ar (ā)RIPT* ‘They were coming to meet (+ dative)*.

243 Maue transcribes *rajagırdā* while Röhborn would like to read *rajagırdā*, the source being *Skt. rājagrha*. Since this is a secondary helping vowel, it might as well be following the harmony of the vowels preceding it; the exception for the suffix would not be all that much of a surprise in view of the double *ugur+dā* in the same passage.
There appears to have been general uncertainty concerning the spelling of learned foreign words, especially those which were probably transmitted in written form by clergy. The rule that they should generally be followed by suffixes of back harmony stands, and exceptions are relatively few.
CHAPTER THREE
MORPHOLOGY

Morphology deals with bound morphemes, their use, their functioning and meaning and the way they alternate in order to express grammatical categories. The description of most grammatical categories is included in this chapter, since these are in Old Turkic generally (though not always) expressed by morphological means. Morphology also comprises word formation in so far as the products of this part of grammar are by no means all to be found in the lexicon; many derived lexemes (e.g. such as are formed with adjectivising +İxg or with the suffix +kİnA used for endearment or with the suffix -(X)ʃ- expressing cooperation or vying) are clearly ad hoc products, not meant to be remembered by the speaker / writer or by the hearer / reader.

Old Turkic bound morphemes are practically always suffixes; the only exception is the expressive reduplication of adjectives, where the first one or two phonemes are repeated with the addition of a further consonant (section 3.112 below and OTWF section 2.23). Old Turkic suffixes generally adhere to synharmonism (see section 2.51 above), which serves as an important boundary marker for the word. Particles like (O)k or mU are, however, taken to be outside the word (i.e. not to be suffixes) even though they also adhere to synharmonism. The reason for this is that a class of word stems (lexical as e.g. verbs or grammatical as e.g. personal pronouns) is defined by the set of suffix paradigms that it allows,244 and suffix paradigms are, in turn, defined among other things by the classes of stems to which they get appended. (O)k or mU, however, can get appended to all classes of words or word groups (and never to stems as such); moreover, they are not followed by bound morphemes (as e.g. the plural suffix +lAr, which in Uygur is used both with nouns and verbs). When postpositions or other elements get synharmonic, they are nevertheless considered to have become suffixes (as happens with täg ‘like’ or, in Orkhon Turkic, with the noun yan ‘side’): They acquire characteristics of case endings applying to a limited set of lexeme classes.

244 Exceptions to this are very rare. One example is the expression bir ikintiş kä ‘one another’; the second word of this common phrase clearly consists of ikini, the ordinal of iki ‘two’, of the dative suffix +kA and, between the two, of what at least looks like the verbal cooperative-reciprocal suffix -(X)ʃ-.
Old Turkic suffixes generally appear in neat chains and each of them is expressed by a neat chain of phonemes (often alternating within archphonemes); this is what is meant when stating that this is an agglutinative language. Morpheme juncture procedures are described in section 2.51 above; see also Erdal 1979a.

A morphological class of lexemes (generally corresponding to a part of speech) opens a chain of morphological slots, which can be filled by suffixes or left empty. A slot left empty may have a specific meaning (‘zero’); this generally happens with verb stems, in that, e.g., the absence of verbal suffixes indicates that the form is to be understood as 2nd person singular imperative. Or it may have no meaning at all, as e.g. with the slot of possessive suffixes on nouns: The absence of possessive suffixes does not mean that the entity belongs to nobody, or that it belongs to the (unmarked) 3rd person. Here is an example for what I mean, from verbal morphology, where possessive suffixes can refer to the subject of the verb: bunça esig kücüg bertökgärü sakınmati türk bodun ölüräyin urugsıratayïn ter ärmiş (KT E10). This sentence can be translated as follows: ‘They (i.e. the Chinese) used to say “Let us kill and exterminate the Turk nation”, not taking into consideration that (we) gave (them) so much service’. The context tells us that the subject of esig kücüg ber- is the Turks; since these are the Turk ruler’s words, ‘we’ and not ‘they’ is appropriate although not indicated by the morphology of bertökgärü or anywhere else in the sentence. Nor is the indirect object of ber- ‘to give’ explicit; we know it from the context, which the addressee’s understanding is made to rely a lot upon by Turkic economy.

3.01 Suffix ordering

The suffixes closer to the stem are, in general, derivational, while those further away are flexional. This is so with verbs, where everything preceding the slot for the negative suffix -mA- is derivational (though not necessarily lexicalized). With other parts of speech, it can happen that suffixes here considered to be derivational follow inflectional suffixes, suffix juncture being in general weaker in non-verbal stems. 245 In the rest of this section we will give examples for cases in which

245 Affixes dealt with under 3.28 below transpose verbal stems (including the affixes preceding them) into a non-verbal class; from the morphological point of view, the product then behaves as any nominal, as a morphological island, as it were. This is not what is below referred to as a morphologically un-normal phenomenon.
certain relatively loose derivational suffixes (all dealt with in section 3.111 below) follow inflectional ones.

In *ikinti+siz* (Mait 48v7) ‘peerless’, literally ‘which has no second’, e.g., the privative suffix is added unto the ordinal form *ikinti* ‘second’. In a case like *beș paramit+lar+siz* ‘without the five *pāramițas*’, (BuddhUig II 641-2), +sXz governs the whole nominal phrase consisting of two words, the number (and hence the plurality expressed by +lAr) of the *pāramițas* being characteristic for these. It is much more common in relatively late texts (as BuddhUig II is) for +lXg to be added to nominals with the plural suffix; here just one example: *amrîlmîsh turulîmîsh a.rxant tîsîlîrîg ayagka tâgemîlg bursaq ku.vrag* (Shô VII a1) ‘the venerable community consisting of *arhats* and pupils, who have attained peace’. *kIñA / +k(I)yA* is also very often added to whole phrases and is, in this, close to being a pragmatic particle;246 in *bir kšan+ta+kya* ‘in a mere fraction of a second’ (BuyKäl 32 and 35) it thus comes to stand after the locative suffix. The equative and instrumental suffixes often precede derivational suffixes: e.g. *änätkâk+çâ+sig* ‘similar to the Indian ones’ (HTs V 4b11) with +lXg, az+rak+çâ+kya ‘just a tiny little bit more’ with the diminutive suffix.247 We find *târk+in+râk kâl* ‘to come rather fast’ (DreiPrinz 26) with the instrumental followed by the elative suffix, and *bir üd+în+kyä* ‘for a very short moment’ (U II 75,8) with the instrumental followed by the diminutive suffix. *+lXg* often appears after the 3rd person possessive suffix, and even after the 1st person: *atî kôtrîlmîš ka+îmîz+lîg m(a)hasamudar ulug taloy ögüz* (BT III 122) ‘our eminent father (i.e. Buddha), the great ocean’. Comparing the morphological involvement of *+lXg* with that of *+kIñA* we find great differences, linked to the fact that, though both are junctorially quite independent, they differ in every other respect; the two are in complementary distribution: *+kIñA* is attested after case suffixes, *+lXg* not; we do, on the other hand, find *+lXg* after number and possessive suffixes, where we have no *+kIñA*. This must be connected with the fact that the tasks of *+kIñA* are endocentric, those of *+lXg* exocentric; *+kIñA* has an extremely strong speaker significance, *+lXg* an exceedingly pale one; *+kIñA* does not, on the other hand, interact with syntactic behaviour while *+lXg* interacts with syntax very strongly.

---

246 As *+lXg* can be considered to be a syntactic particle in relatively late Uygur sources. See details on the use of *+kIñA* in OTWF section 2.1.

247 Other such instances are *tap+în+çâ+kya*, *tüg+în+çâ+küyä*, *uz+în+çâ+kya*, *umîr+çâ+kya* ‘just as much as one is able to’, *an+çâ+kya* ‘that little’ and *mun+çâ+kya* ‘this little’.
3.02 Bracketing

Inflectional or derivational suffixes are frequently appended to phrases or other syntagms. A few examples for this were quoted in the previous paragraph: (bir üd)+iün+kyä ‘for a very short moment’, (bir kšan)+ta+kyä ‘in a mere fraction of a second’, some complex instances with +lXg248 and (beš paramït+lar)+sîz ‘without the five pâramitâs’; here is an even more involved instance with the privative suffix: In ançakya minâgülük münstüz ârîp ... (ETŞ 15,30) ‘You are free from even the smallest fault to be blamed for’ mün (by itself) is qualified by the ‘small clause’ münä-gülük ‘to be blamed’ and by expressive ançakya, and the whole serves as base for +sXz.

3.03 Group inflexion

In a way related to the above but still to be considered as a distinct phenomenon is the situation where affixes added only to the last element in a series are understood to apply also to the previous parallel members, as the first plural suffix in the following: känç uri känç kïzlar körkin körü kurtulgu tïnlïglar (Kuan 139) are ‘beings who are to be saved by seeing the figures of young boys and young girls’. The vision to be seen by each being may here consist of a single boy or girl or of more than one, but is unlikely to consist of a single little boy but a number of little girls; i.e. the suffix +lAr must apply both to kïz and to

248 Here are some additional ones: bir yïntäm ‘exclusively’ (see OTWF 69) must come from yin ‘member’, but the etymology makes semantic sense only if one considers the formative +dAm (dealt with in OTWF section 2.31) to have here been added to the phrase bir yin ‘one member’. bir yauqf ‘uniform’ similarly comes from adding the formative +lXg to the phrase bir yaq ‘one type’, bir idâš ‘having a common cause’ (especially common in the Kšanti Kilguluk nom, edited in separate parts by Röhrborn and Warnke) from adding the formative +dAš to bir iš ‘one karma’. +sIg (OTWF section 2.32) is also added to bracketed nominal phrases in (öpi yer)+sîg ak ‘flowing as if at different places (of a river)’ (HTsPek as quoted in UW 78) and (tümän mïn tï)+sîg ‘as if in thousands of myriads of shapes’ (QB 829). In akar sâvlük ‘an area, a place with flowing water’ (ETŞ 8,4), +lXk is added to a participle + head. The second phrase of körümî  ulați tärs tätrü töröçi (TT VI 331) ‘diviners and other followers of wrong teachings’ is to be analysed as (tärs tätrü törö)+çi; +çI would not make sense when added to törö ‘teaching’ by itself. Similarly nomlarnïg (çin kertü tïz)+sîz+in ... bilîlär (Suv 386,7) ‘They know that the dharmas are without any real root’. The phrase bir ägsüksüz is used in contracts (e.g. UjgRuk 19, FenTen II 5) as a synonym of tükäl ‘complete(ly)’. It has +sXz added to the predicate of the clause bir ägsük ‘one is missing’, giving ‘not one missing’.
They cut each other with awls, knives and swords’ the shared element is the instrumental suffix. With the locative case suffix we can quote ol yakin (Mait 171v2 = MaitH XX 1r21) ‘There is nobody either among the gods above or among the human beings below who restrains the power of that demon’. As in the previous example, the elements üstün türi ‘gods above’ and altın yahyk ‘men below’ are not bracketed; they do, however, constitute a natural antithetical pair and not merely coordinated elements of a sentence. This is not the case in the instances in the following passage: kişi ... yinik körni, nomug učuzladačilar üçün, anin burxanlar anta tugmaz; küçükleri tar, kırları tari üçün kut bulmiş tüzüllər bo tılaqın anta barname (HTs V 100-106) ‘Because they humiliate people and disparage teaching, that is why Buddhas are not born there; because their mind are narrow and their filth deep, for that reason ğrəsə who have found blessing do not go there’: Both pairs have the postposition üçün in common but in the first pair the plural suffix is also shared. In əki kudug eliqlər kamag teqtilərin kunçuylə[i]n tözümləriňlugun (DreiPrinz 119) ‘the two blessed kings together with all their princes, wives and retinue’ the case suffix is shared but the oblique or accusative form of the possessive suffix is not; this and the fact that it does not, for some reason, adhere to synharmonism make it similar in behaviour to a postposition. The accusative form of the possessive suffix is shared by a binome in büksiz mınışzızın ukup (MaitH XV 5r27) ‘he understands (their) transience and ...’. The plural suffix can be shared also by finite verbs, as in alku ayığ öğürdi səvintilər (Saddh 39) ‘They all rejoiced greatly’; ögir- səvın- is a biverb. It would have been unthinkable for the verbs to share a verbal suffix such as -dI.

3.04 Parts of speech

There is a sharp distinction between verbs on the one hand and the other parts of speech on the other: While unbound elements are often found

249 One ms. among four writes urılar here, but leaves urı in line 140, where a similar expression appears.

250 Spelled thus? The editors of this chapter of the Hami ms. write biri, which gives no meaning. No facts of the page where this word appears reached Europe; the text of this passage is based solely on the transcription of Prof. Geng, who may have made a mistake: bič ‘awl’, another possible interpretation of what Geng may have seen, is less likely because bi bič is a common binome.

251 The possibility that teqtilərin and kunçuyl[i]n are not accusative but instrumental forms seems less likely to me.
to belong to two, often even three among the other parts of speech (noun, adjective, adverb, postposition, conjunction etc.) and borders between noun and adjective, adjective and adverb, adverb and postposition, pronoun and conjunction etc. are rather fuzzy, verb stems very rarely serve as anything else. This is the position, among others, of Grönbech 1936: 18-19, who points out that there may be coincidence between verbs and nominals in some cases, derivation through homophonous suffixes (e.g. -(X)š- and -(X)n- and -(X)n-) in others, but that verbs and all other lexeme classes are in principle clearly distinct. One might add that convergence may also have had some influence, verbal and nominal stems which happen to be similar in meaning and shape having drawn even closer as they got associated with each other by speakers. Doerfer 1982 gives a long list of entities he considers to be ‘Nomenverba’; one obvious Old Turkic example is karï ‘old’ and karï- ‘to get old’. There are a number of such clear instances, though a part of Doerfer’s list must certainly be rejected as the actual meanings are in fact not all too close. In any case, the phenomenon is of etymological though not of grammatical relevance (unlike English or Chinese).

Morphology has here been divided into four groups: the nominals (also comprising adjectives, pronouns and numerals), verbs (comprising verb forms transposed into other classes, i.e. participles, converbs etc.), adjuncts (comprising adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions and particles) and interjections.

3.1. Nominals

Nominals are lexemes which can serve as heads of noun phrases and are thus capable of reference. As a morphological feature, all nominals can receive case suffixes. The term covers nouns (including proper names), adjectives, pronouns and numerals. We speak of ‘adjectives’ as a special sub-class because there is an (admittedly fuzzy) semantic distinction between the two classes: Adjectives tend to denote qualities and are used for referring less frequently than nouns. They also have a lot in common with adverbs. Furthermore, the stem of gradable adjectives can be reduplicated or they can get expanded by +rAk,\(^{252}\) none of which is possible with nouns. There also are formatives such as +sIg specifically forming adjective-type lexemes, and +lXg more often

\(^{252}\) See section 3.112 for procedures of intensification.
forms adjectives than nouns. Colour adjectives, finally, have special
formatives.

The following typologically important characteristic is, however, a
challenge to the distinction between nouns and adjectives: Lexemes
denoting semantical predicates serve as abstract nouns as well, i.e. they
not only qualify entities identified by bearing the predicate but also
refer to the abstract quality denoted by this predicate. In the latter case
they usually get a possessive suffix referring to the bearer of the quality
in question, as ādgū+sī 'her goodness', or kef+in tārīḫ+in (poss. 3. sg.
accusative) tūpkārgālī (BT I A 12) 'to fathom its breadth or its depth'.
Thus ādgū is attested both as 'good' and 'goodness', bil-gā both as
'wise' and 'the quality of being wise, one's wisdom' while yer suv
ārtįmlîg+i is 'the transience of the material world' from ārt-i
'transient'. The agentively derived armak+i can signify both 'deceitful
(person)' and '(somebody's) deceit'; Orkhon Turkic armakći+i tēcān
(KT E 6) is not 'for his deceiver' but 'because of its (i.e. the Chinese
nation's) deceitfulness'. yakvlāk is both 'bad' and 'badness,
wickedness'; in the inscriptive sentence karluk yakvlak sākip tāzā
bardī, it may, moreover, also have been used in adverbial function
(unless it signifies 'bad thoughts'). kōrgālī umazlar anîŋ tārīḫ+i (HTs
VIII 42) signifies 'They are unable to perceive its depth', tārīḫ 'deep'
having been used as abstract noun; alternately one could translate 'They
are unable to see how deep it is'. In tükāl bilgū tāŋri burtxan yarlıkamiš
koŋi kertū nommun tînglîg bo montag yeg+i adrok+i biżînlâr (TT X
558) one can translate yeg+i adrok+i as 'its superiority and excellence'
or as 'that it is superior and excellent'. kičīg+i+tā (BT VIII A 163)
from kičīg 'small' is 'in my childhood', kičīg+kyā+m+tā (HTs)
in my earliest childhood'. The following DLT proverb shows āgrî both as
'bentness' and as 'bent': yīlāŋ kändū āgrîsîn bilmâz, teve buynîŋ āgrî
ter 'The snake does not know its own bentness (i.e. how bent it itself is)
and calls the camel’s neck ‘bent’.' All this explains how +sXz ‘without'
denotes lack when added to lexemes normally used nominally, but
antonymy when added to adjectives: Examples for abstract +sXz forms
(not necessarily with any possessive suffix to refer to the bearer of the
quality) are mentioned in OTWF 133. Further, it explains why -mîš or
-gAn form participles (i.e. verbal adjectives) in some modern Turkic
languages but action nouns (i.e. verbal abstracts) in others; why some
languages can have one and the same infinite verb form in both of these
uses; how the -(X)p converb could come to form the head of analytical
finite verb phrases (in Azeri). In tīrīŋ+dā+kī+čā, which signifies 'as in
one’s lifetime’, tīrīŋ ‘alive’ is not just ‘life’ but rather ‘somebody’s
being alive'; hence a syntactic expansion like atalarĩ ölmĩš+tũ+ki+čũ (ms. T III 228 1029) can signify `as when their fathers had died': ölmĩš does not refer to those being compared but to their fathers. What here becomes an abstract nominal is the whole phrase atalarĩ ölmĩš. To return to adjectives as lexemes: It can be stated that their three-fold versatility, the ability of describing qualities on the one hand, of denoting, on the other hand, these qualities themselves or their bearers, is what defines them as a word class (cf. Johanson 2003).

Another way to create abstractions was by prop words like köğũł or bilig: simtag is both `careless, neglectful' and `neglect, carelessness'. `care' or `carefulness', its opposite is simtagsĩç köğũł (see OTWF 203). kũvãnc köğũł is `pride, arrogance' (while `a proud and arrogant state of mind' is kũvãncãñ köğũł). Similarly œfũ bilig `anger' or yarlikançučũ bilig `commiseration' from yarlikançučũ `compassionate'.

Pronouns are also nominals; elements such as œz form a bridge between nouns and (referring or adnominal) pronouns in serving as both. Old Turkic numerals can also be assigned to the general category of nominals, although they have special morphological categories; their syntactic characteristics are shared by quantitative adjectives.

The Old Turks derived proper names both from verb and from noun forms: Lexemes denoting animals, often birds, were commonly used as proper names, as were adjectives of positive content. Imperative verb forms often serve as proper names. Male and female proper nouns often get an element +A added to such imperatives or to simple nouns or adjectives, as Togana from togan `falcon’, Tũkãlã from tũkãl `perfect’ or Kutãda from kut+ad `Be happy, blessed!’. Diminutive / caritatīve forms also serve as proper names. Phrasal names such as Tirigãltmišã (Wpo2,11 in SammlUigKontr 2) < tirig `ült-miš +ã `brought forth alive’ are not rare.

This chapter starts with the formation of nouns and adjectives: Nominal stems can be derived from other nominal stems or from verbal stems. The former are discussed in section 3.111, the latter in section 3.112; see OTWF vol. 1 for more details on nominal derivation. We

---

253 1Xk is used for forming abstractions in Qarakhanid only, Uygur examples being rare and late; in OTWF 126 this is explained by the fact that Uygur was a contact language with Chinese, which Qarakhanid wasn’t. Here, nevertheless, is one instance from a letter, a text type notorious for introducing progressive forms: övlilik ayidu ider bûz `We inquire about the well-being of those at home'; see OTWF 126 for a few additional examples. The matter is discussed in Röhrborn 1995.

254 E.g. Üdrat `Increase (tr.)!’, Asil `Multiply (intr.)!’, Üklit `Make numerous!’, Kantur `Make glad!’ or Tusul `Be beneficial!’.
subsequently turn to the inflectional morphology of these lexical classes.

3.111. Denominal derivation of nominals
Nominals are formed from other nominals for certain specific purposes: Derived nominals can express smallness, endearment or pity (OTWF section 2.1); nominals (especially adjectives) can be intensified (OTWF section 2.2); nominals can be formed which express similarity of some sort with the base nominal (OTWF section 2.3); nominals can be marked for a class to which they are said to belong (OTWF section 2.4); derived nominals can express collectivity (OTWF section 2.5); they can also express certain functions related to the base noun (OTWF section 2.7) or characterisation by the base noun (OTWF section 2.9). Denominal derivation can express presence or absence of the entity denoted by the base (OTWF section 2.8) or, finally, serve syntactic purposes (as with the suffix +lXg).

There are two productive diminutive suffixes: +(X)c, added for endearment to terms for family members, and +kIñA / +klyA used e.g. for pitying or affectionate reference to children and other beloved or cherished creatures. +(X)c is, in the great majority of cases, used with 1st person possessive suffixes, e.g. ög+üč+iũm or ög+üč+iũmuz ‘my / our dear mother’ (six times BT XIII 12, BT IX 219,2), yänä+č+iũm(iz) ,my / our dear sister in law’ (FamArch 126 and HamTouen 20,2). ŋaŋ+č+iŋ+ka ‘to your dear father’ (MaitH XI 12r13) is a rare instance with the 2nd person possessive. ata+č+iũm ‘my dear father’ and ana+č+iũm ‘my dear mother’ with the colloquial words for ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are especially common, the first of these since the runiform inscriptions; see the UW for Uygur examples of these two.

A rare suffix of endearment of the shape +(I)cAk may be attested in koli+cak and boto+cak: iki količak(i) atus’m boyn[ın] kučup ... (U III 64,13) ‘(the poor child) hugged his father’s neck with his two little arms and ...’; botečaklarımın karnı ačmıš (BT XIII 2,39) ‘It seems that my little camel colts (said in endearment about children) are hungry’. See OTWF 46-47 for several words which may be formed with similar suffixes.

While +(X)c, +(I)cAk and the suffix +kIñA, to which we turn straightway, are of pragmatic use in the sense that they express the speaker’s feelings towards the entity he is referring to, the suffixes +Ak and +Ik do not go beyond the lexicon: They denote entities which are, as it were, a smaller version of what is denoted by the base. kapak and čanak, e.g., are vessels which are smaller than kap and čan; from yul
'spring' we have yul+ak (Majt 139r12 and v20), defined by Käšgarî as 'a spring with little water'. öz and özök appear to be 'water ways' related in a similar manner. With animal names the relationship between base and derive seems to be more imaginative: kamičak , tadpole' < kamič 'ladle' because of its shape, oglak 'kid' < ogul 'son', adgïrak 'white-footed antelope' < adgïr 'stallion' and the like. topïk 'ankle bone' < top 'ball', čöp+ik 'impurity' < čöp 'little stick', kas+îk 'piece of bark', but+îk 'branch' < but 'leg' appear to be formed with a different formative, +îk.

+kïnA, the most productive diminutive / caritative suffix,\(^{255}\) becomes +kïnA in Uygur or, less commonly, +kïnA (e.g. azkïnä 'very little' in KP 7.6 and a few other examples; see section 2.33). With terms referring to the speaker/writer, +kïnA/+kïnA expresses modesty and self-depreciation. It sometimes also appears with adjectives and adverbs denoting smallness, shortness of time and the like by themselves (as azkïnä just mentioned). +kïnA / +kïnA is added to inflectional forms or to whole phrases; e.g. bir kïn+tä+kïnä ymä 'even in just one moment (kïn)' (BuyKäl 32) or bizni tâg yuš+îk+kyä+lar, which its context shows to signify 'people like us, who just get to be a hundred years (yuš) old' (BT II 936). It is in some ways similar to a particle (note also because its products are not distinct lexemes); this double nature of being a formative preceding all inflection on the one hand, of being like a particle both formally and semantically on the other hand, is retained in some modern languages where it lives on, like Uzbek and Bashkir.

+sîg forms adjectives signifying 'similar to (or trying to be like) the base nominal'; as in döjî+sîg and adîn+sîg 'distinct', bar+sîg 'as if existing', ulug+sîg 'vain'. The formative +dAm (as in tägr+îmä 'divine') appears to have a similar meaning.

+AğUt forms status designations, as the very common bayagut 'merchant, notable' and alpagut 'warrior'. The form also appears in binomes with underlying nominals, as bay bayagut, baš bašagut 'foremost (pupil)' (Mait 160v2) or uz uzagut 'specialist' (ManMon 30).

Colour names have special derivates, formed with suffixes such as +gXI, +sI and +Xê; see OTWF section 2.6. +(l)dUrXk forms names of implements spatially connected with human or animal body parts, such as boyunduruk 'yoke', beldïrük 'belt', sakalduruk 'cap strap under the chin'. +(l)dUrXk appears to have had a variant +(l)dArXk now attested

\(^{255}\) It also seems to be the only originally Turkic one: All the suffixes mentioned hitherto apparently come from Indo-European (though this is not the place to go into details on etymology).
in karî+ltarak ‘upper arm bracelet’ in DKPAMPb 1138 (r and v confused in the facs.).

+lxk forms derivates with a variety of meanings and functions (as also nowadays in many Turkic languages), which get lexicalised to different degrees; however, all of them have the general relational content of ‘purpose, assignment’ in common. +lxk is also part of the inflectional suffix -gvlxk, which forms modal action nouns and projection participles and is dealt with in section 3.284. Firstly, +lxk forms adjectives and adverbs pointing to the future, which are derived from bases denoting stretches of time: bîng yîl+lik tûmân kûn+lik bîtîgîmîn bâlgîmîn ... yassî taška yaratîttîm (ŠU E9 and Tariat W2) ‘I had my written words and my mark, intended for thousand years and ten thousand days, affixed onto a flat stone’. Similarly apamus+luk bûl(ü)lgü tanga ‘a mark and seal for eternity’ (HTsPar 232,14), tûmân kalplîk adrlurlar ‘They get separated for a myriad of kalpas’ (Warnke 484), oglumîn Çîntsu Šîlaka uîc yîl+lîk tutgok bertîm ‘I gave my son as a slave to Č.Ş. for three years’ (UjgRuk I 4) and so forth. Secondly, +lxk forms adjectives denoting a status, use or function assigned, or to be assigned to a human or any other entity: bâg+lik urî oglu! ì$ #% ç, esi+îlk kîz oğlaj küg bolî (KT E34) ‘Your sons, meant to be lords, became slaves, your daughters, meant to be ladies, became concubines’. A Manichaean example is anvamîg yutuzluk âllîmîn ‘Take yourself A. as wife!’ (M III 14,41); further bâglîk âr ‘a man to be lord and master’ (U I 21,14), tegînka kulluk barîr bîz ‘We are going to the prince to serve him’ (KP 23,3), buştîlîk ârdînîlîr ‘jewels to serve as alms’ (U III 12,15), tapîlîk tavar ‘object to serve as a token of respect’ (HTs VII 2051). Thirdly, +lxk nouns denote places intended for entities as denoted by the base noun, or where such entities are found in abundance, as bûrluk ‘vinyard’, çâçâklîk ‘flower garden’, kalvalîk ‘vegetable garden’, agîlîk or xûmsîlîk ‘treasury’, 256 yagîlîk ‘a place for sacrifices’ or tayğîlîk ‘a temple’.

+dâš lexemes denote persons (exceptions are quite rare) who are companions to the entity denoted by the base noun or have that entity in common. Uygur instances are nom+dâš ‘a person adhering to the same faith (nom << Greek vîwoc ‘law’) as one’s own’ or körk+dâš ‘a person’s shape-fellow’ or ‘shadow soul’, which becomes visible in a mirror or a drawing (körk ‘shape’ < kör- ‘to see’).

256 Etymologically speaking, the suffix of the last-mentioned is unnecessary, as xûmsî already signified ‘granary’ in Chinese; the DLT also gives kômêş as ‘treasure’. In copying between languages, categorial transparency is commonly revived through additional affixes; e.g. Turkish evlat+lar ‘children’ < Arabic awlâd ‘children’.
The denotees of +čl nominals are persons who are habitually or professionally engaged in an activity in some way involving the denotive of the base. This formation will here be dealt more in detail than the other formations, as it became very active in the participle domain (see section 3.282 below). The implied activities in which the base is involved can be quite diverse. suv+čč is a ‘sea pilot’ in KP 22,4-5 but a ‘water superintendent’ in USp 88,46. ok+čč clearly an ‘archer’ in QB 2370 but an ‘arrow maker’ in QB 4458. sav+čč is a glorious title in Prière Man A 9 but has a clearly negative meaning in TT IV B 21; yag+čč, finally, is just ‘a quarrelsome person’ in Mait 82r26 but ‘a soldier’ in all its eight QB instances. Such examples might suggest that PQ5RSč, TUč or yagčč are not entries in the mental lexicon but created each time according to the context’s needs.

yagčč just mentioned, kāmič ‘a jealous person’, ṭvāčč ‘bad tempered’ and būyančč ‘meritorious’ label people by their qualities rather than their profession.257 There is a wide variety of implied verbs: tamgačč (earliest in KT N 13) is the person who bears the royal seal and uses it. A titigčč is a man who makes mud (titig) walls and an aščč prepares food. An altunčč, sasīčč or tāmirčč use the denotees of the bases (gold, clay and iron) as material to make objects; thus also ĩgaččč, as we understand from the context. In other contexts, ĩgačč could be a tree cutter; a targačč makes or sells combs. A tucčč collects and/or sells the object (salt) while a bōzčč makes or sells it (cotton cloth). A kalančč is somebody who does agricultural work for the state instead of paying the kalan tax. The āvčč ‘housewife’ and the bɔɾjučč ‘wine grower, wine cultivator’ (not the owner of a vineyard) work in the place denoted by the base. A yuţuţčč looks at his object (stars) to predict the future while the yunčč, koṭčč, uđčč and yagačč have terrestrial objects (horses, sheep, bovines and elephants) to watch and tend.

+čč nouns practically always denote humans258 who are initiators of events or activities: kāmič and kāŋlačč are people who sail and drive ships and carts respectively, not passengers on these vehicles. The ťuŋčč (U II 8,37 and TT IV A 21) is not a listener (as one might think in view of the derivate ťuŋčč- ‘to listen’), but the person who communicates things to be listened to; ḳapagčč is a ‘doorkeeper’, not somebody who is

257 So do the very common yarlıkančč ‘compassionate’ and its rare near-synonyms ĭrîkkenččč and sakîncčč (see OTWF 114-5), which can be considered to be deverbal as no corresponding -(Χ)enčč forms are attested. Thus also armakčč ‘deceitful person’ (already KT E6), which comes from ar-mak ‘deceit’ and not from the verb.

258 I have met only one instance where the referent is an animal: kan+čč kurt ‘a leech’ in a Brāhmi text, from kan ‘blood’.
locked in or out by a door. +êI often forms derivates from names of activities; thus avêî ‘hunter’ < av ‘hunt’, oyumêî ‘player’ < oyun ‘game’, sîğîêî ‘wailer’ < sîğî ‘lamentation’ or yelîêî ‘sorcerer’ < yelî ‘sorcery’. This makes derivates from denominal verbs, e.g. *øyangûcî or *sîgtagûcî, superfluous. Agentivity was a central characteristic of this formative already prehistorically: This is what made it part of the highly productive agentive formatives -(ê)geî and -(ê)UêI dealt with in the section 3.113, and presumably also of the subject participle -(ê)AêI (section 3.282), which serves as future form in Orkhon Turkic (section 3.234).

Not all combinations of deverbal formatives with +êI fused into deverbal formations. Two such formative sequences are mentioned above; another two are -(ê)jm+êI (e.g. exceptionally not all too agentive olûmêî ‘creature doomed to death’) and -(ê)sh+êI (e.g. tümûcî ‘quarreler’, öcâcêî ‘contender’ or turušcî ‘opponent’). Kûzîêî ‘guardian’, one of the products of the -(ê)j+êI sequence, governs objects, just as -(ê)geî and -(ê)UêI do; e.g. in the common expression yêrtîncî kûzîèî, a loan translation from Skt. lokapâî ‘guardian of the world’.

+sXz denotes lack when added to nouns. When it is added to adjectives it signals their non-applicability, e.g. bûksîz ‘infirm’, mûnjûsîz ‘transient, not eternal’, čûnsîz ‘untrue’, adînsîgsîz ‘immutable’. Baglêî bir ûrû ‘since the lords and the people were in discord’, bir ûrgûsî ‘substituting one missing (i.e.) complete’; âî’îz ürsîcîn ûkîtu ‘explaining the body’s transience’ (< ürîlûk ‘everlasting’) or ‘teaching that the body is transient’. In the Tuñokok inscription, (but not e.g. in the KT and BQ inscriptions) +sXz could have had the shape +sIz, as it is written with s² in Tuñ 48, and in the instrumental form in Tuñ 35 as s²zn². This accords with the first vowel of the suffix +sIrA- ‘to be or become without (the base noun)’, which is derived from the privative suffix using the formative +A-.

+lXg was, in the Orkhon inscriptions, a formative signifying ‘Possessing the denotive of the base’, as in küclûg ‘powerful’, kûnlûg ‘having female slave(s)’, xaganlîg ‘having a xagan’. In Uygur it has a wide variety of uses, indicating, e.g., origin (Solmîlîg Alp Totok Ögrûncû), material (kûmûlûg tîrgûklär ‘silver-plated pillars’), apposition (tâgî kîzlarîlîg terîn kuvraq ‘the assembly of god-maidens’) or metaphor (nîzvaniîtîg kir ‘the dirt of passions’), and governs some very involved constructions partly described in section 4.122 below (see OTWF section 2.91 for a full treatment). +lXg is sometimes
preceded by \(+lAr\) or by possessive suffixes; examples are given in
section 3.01. Interestingly, it is preceded by the 3rd person possessive
suffix in the shape which we find before postpositions; e.g. in
harxan kut+in+liɡ kılık (Pfahl I 8), where a ‘vehicle’ (Skt. yanā) is presented
as a metaphor for Buddhahood. \((s)ln+\) might then be the shape which
the possessive suffix has also when it precedes derivational elements
and not only postpositions (the only one attested in this position being
\(+lXg\)). In another appositional instance of \(+lXg\), a personal pronoun also
appears in the shape it has before postpositions, which is (as with the
possessive suffix) identical with the accusative: biz-nilig eɾinč tıňıɡlar
(UgOn III B r3) ‘us poor creatures’. Another possibility is that \(+lXg\)
was really felt to be a postposition, since it has such loose juncture in
Uygur (cf. OTWF p.151). In other cases, however, we have the
possessive suffix appearing without /n/ before \(+lXg\); for this there might
again be two reasons: Along with other changes in Uygur, this /n/ was
dropped also before postpositions (section 3.124), and the instances
without /n/ might be part of that historical development. As a different
possibility, \(+lXg\) may have come to be felt to be a concatenating
particle, and particles never demand this oblique form of what precedes
them.

3.112. Intensification of adjectives and adverbs
Intensification applies to adjectives and adverbs but not to nouns,
except the use of the clitic particle \((O)k\) (which can, in fact, modify any
textual entity). \(+rAk\) forms elatives and comparatives. It might be a
particle rather than a formative as it practically never forms lexemes, as
its products do not differ from their bases in lexical content, as it hardly
ever is followed by formatives but sometimes appears even after
inflectional morphology. \(+rAk\) is added to adjectives (e.g. yarpıɾk sav
‘quite difficult phrases’) and adverbs (e.g. aɾsnurak ‘before, earlier’) but
not to colour terms, which are graded by reduplication. \(+rAk\) forms
govern the case form in \(+dA\): e.g. ay tágri tılgıntı sàviɡliɾąk
‘lovelier than the moon disc’ (comparative); barčada iɄɡıɾıɾąk
barčada üzüɾąk (BT V 170-171) ‘more central (Ʉɡıɾı ‘inside’) than
everything else and highest (üzü ‘above’) of all’ (elative). In yık
iɄkəklərdı Ʉstıɾıɾąk yavıɾak ‘worse than demons and vampires’
(DKPAMPb 152) comparison is expressed by the adjective Ʉstıɾı itself
expanded by \(+rAk\). Together with takı ‘more’ we have antada takı
yegrı ‘even better than that’ or, adverbially, Ʉɡ+in+ta kaɾ+in+ta takı
yegrı arə kırıɾ ‘he intercedes (arə kır-) for them even better than their
mother and father’.
Elative content is also expressed by repeating the same adjective as in yarok+ta yarok ‘brightest’, a glad+a glad (MaitH XI 6r 10:11) ‘most unfrequented’, avīngu+ta avīngu ‘most amusing’ or artok+ta artok sūzök (Mait 26A r6) ‘exceedingly pure’. Compared adjectives need not have +rAk either, as in muntada ymā muṣṣadīnīg ‘more wondrous than this’ (Mait 26A r3).

Reduplication is another means of intensification limited to adjectives and adverbs. Here the stem is preceded by a syllable consisting of the first consonant (if it starts with one), followed by the first vowel and p: e.g. kap+kara ‘quite black’ (and other colour names), tīp+tīz ‘quite level’ (and other shape adjectives), āp+ūnīg ‘quite clean’, āp+ūnīn ‘quite healthy’ or tūp+tūnīg ‘quite uninterruptedly’. This is the only productive morphological process which is not suffixal; the reason must have been iconic (in modern languages the additional syllable bears the word stress). More on Old Turkic reduplication can be found in OTWF § 2.23, on +rAk in § 2.22.

Superlatives are formed by preposing the particle āŋ to adjectives; Uygur examples can be found in the UW; āŋ is attested also in runiform and Qarakhanid sources. ulūg+i ‘the big one among them’ and kiči+i ‘the small one among them’ are quite often found in adnominal use with superlative meaning both with and without āŋ: āŋ ulūgī tegin (Suv 608,15:17) is ‘the eldest prince’, šankī atlag ulūgī ogli-nilni bāšī (MaitH XV 13v4) ‘the head of his eldest son called Šankha’; ulūgī tānī and kiči+i tānī (ManOu7g 1a r1 and 8) signify ‘the greatest’ and ‘the smallest god’ respectively. ulūgī does not have to be adjacent to its head: ulūgī mahabale tegin (Suv 609,23) ‘the oldest prince, Mahabala’. In ol yāklărādā ulūgī (ManUgFr r5) ‘the leader of those demons’ the group out of which the entity referred to is the biggest appears in the locative case form; similarly kamagta āŋ ken(ki) ‘the very last’ etc. (UW).

3.113. Deverbal derivation of nominals
This topic will be dealt with rather summarily here; see OTWF part III for details. We distinguish four groups of deverbal nominals by their functions. Firstly, nominals derived from verbs with most formatives denote either the subject when the verb is intransitive and the object when the verb is transitive, or the action; they are called ‘ergative’ in OTWF because this distribution reminds one of the uses of the

259 From avīną- ‘to divert oneself’; see section 3.284 for the -gU formation.
260 DLT fol. 165 says that the Oguz could use /m/ or (in one case) /s/ instead of /p/.
nominative in languages which show ergative sentence structure: It marks the subject of intransitive verbs but the object of transitive ones. Secondly, nominals formed with -ČUK, -gUČ and -gOK (for which see OTWF section 3.2) denote instruments. A third group, consisting of positive -(X)nČÇg (probably < -(X)nČ±sIg) and negative -gULXksXz, denotes adjectives qualifying potential direct and indirect objects. Examples for -(X)nČÇg are akla-CČg ‘hateful’, amra-nČÇg ‘lovely’, kork-nČÇg ‘frightful’, yürük yaril-nČÇg ‘heart-rending’; using an adjective of this formation, the speaker states that an entity qualified by it is likely to induce in anybody the state of mind described by the verb from which the form is derived. -gULXksXz adjectives (e.g. adkangulucksuz ‘what one should not adhere to’, titgülüksüz ‘what one is not expected to renounce’, adırgulucksuz ‘something which should not be separated’) describe entities as connected with an action which should not be carried out. When used predicatively, adjectives formed in this way state about entities that they are such that actions described by the base verb should not be carried out in connection with them. -gULXksXz differs from -mAgULXk (described in section 3.284) in not reflecting the wish of the speaker/writer but rather his opinion concerning prohibitions. A fourth group of deverbal nominals, dealt with below a bit more extensively, is agentive.261

The deverbal derivate group showing ergative behaviour is clearly the largest, both by number of formations (18 opaque ones) and by the number of derivates. The formatives (in descending order of importance) are -(X)g, -(O)k, -Xš, 262 -(X)nČ, -(X)nČU, -(X)m, -Xn, -(U)t, -mA, -gI, -(X)ž, -gXn etc.. The common and composite -(X)glXg and, in the negative domain, -(X)nČsXz form adjectives qualifying nominals which show the same ‘ergative’ behaviour. The formations mentioned differ in the degree to which they are lexicalised to denote the action or the event itself; with -(X)g, e.g., event nominals form the greatest group, while they are very much of a minority with -(O)k, another common formation. -(X)nČ and -(X)nČU were distinct formatives and not phonetic or morphophonemic alternants of each other (as has often been assumed), although contaminations and some confusion between them took place already in early times. While -(X)nČ forms are usually associated with verb stems ending in /n/ and may have their source in the formative -Xš being added to these (with [nš] > [nČ] as subsequent development), such a connection can hardly be detected with -(X)nČU.

261 The formation in -gAk does not quite fit into any of these; cf. OTWF §3.327.
262 This and -Xn are dominant formations; see section 2.51 above.
The formation in -(X)m is in the DLT and in a few late Uygur texts used for denoting measurement units of substances; see the end of section 3.14.

-(X)g, which is the most common formative for deverbal nouns (see OTWF § 3.101), was involved in suffix derivations and suffix compounding which sometimes led into inflection: The DLT (fol. 582) deals with -(X)glXk as a ‘participle of necessity’. The converb suffix -(X)glcA (see section 3.286) probably comes from -(X)g+s(h)n+cA, i.e. with the possessive suffix in the equative case. The ergative suffix -(X)glXg and agentive -(X)gel (see below) as well as the desiderative suffix -(X)gsA- (section 3.212) also contain this element. All this means that -(X)g must have been just as common, or even commoner and more productive, in prehistorical times.

Nominals derived with -(X)gelI, -(X)mlXg, -(X)A, -(X)An, a few minor formatives and -(X)mxksXz always refer to or qualify the subject of the verb they are derived from.263 This is clearly a secondary group: -(X)gelI, -(X)mlXg and -(X)mxksXz are composite; -(X)A and -(X)An appear to have been taken over from inflectional morphology (and probably not the other way around): -(X)A may have been related to -(X)Ay264 while -(X)An is the Common Turkic participle suffix. Deverbal nominals may originally all have been of the ergative type. In the negative domain there is a three-way division of tasks between composite forms: -(X)mxksXz denotes only subjects, -(X)UlXksXz all other participants but never the subject and -(X)mcsXz the subject if the verb is intransitive but the object if it is transitive.

The -(X)gel form sometimes has verbal government; here are two instances with the dative: üc xerndikä tap içü conquer üçäkä kamka tap içü conquer üçäkä tap içü conquer three jewels are few; creatures worshipping demons, vampires and magicians are numerous, my lord"; burxanlarip nom tilginän ävitrigikä, altï p(a)ramitlarip toşgurtguka ötügü bolsar, ... nom tözän aça yada uktügü ötügü bolsar (Suv 181,16-22) ‘if he becomes one who prays for the buddhas to turn the wheel of dharma and to fulfill the six worlds, ... who prays for (staying on earth for innumerable ages and) explaining and dissipating the essence of the law ...’.

263 In the Suv the form -(X)uI is used also for qualifying objects; see section 3.282.

264 The relationship between -(X)A and -(X)Ay is discussed in section 3.234 below. The deverbal suffix -(X)cstOk / -(X)AsOk (OTWF section 2.93) must also have been formed from such nominal -(X)A through the denominal suffix +sOk (dealt with in that same section of OTWF).
Derivates formed with other compound deverbal suffixes containing +čI can also govern objects: -(U)t+čI, e.g., in ay őlűči in TT VI 92, where the moon is governed by őlűr-, the base of őlűči.265 Another deverbal form capable of verbal government is -(X)m+čI, in isig öz alümčílar (several times in Suv) and perhaps another phrase quoted in OTWF 117.266 It is certainly no coincidence that all the deverbal nouns quoted as governing objects are composed of +čI as final element, +čI being an agentive formative even though it is denominal.267 Note, however, that it was not impossible, in principle, for other formatives to show such government: Kāšgarī creates the sentence ol āvin bāzät-ıgsā-k which he translates verbally as ‘He longs for his house to get painted’ the form in question is an -(O)k derivate of a desiderative in -(X)gsA- from a causative verb.

The functions of -(X)mlčXg, the most active among the ergative suffixes, are documented and discussed in OTWF section 3.119. közi yım-üglüg olorur ārtı ‘He used to sit with closed eyes’ (HTs VI 2b9) is similar to özi atanmü, ögrünmüğ, afi yet-ıglıg källir (IrqB LV) ‘He comes a famous and joyful man, his horse being led (for him)’ in that both forms are predicative and accompanied by their objects (köz ‘eye’ and at ‘horse’ respectively). More often, such expressions are adnominal, as yığrük atların koş-uglug kağılı (Suv 625,5) ‘a chariot harnessed to swift horses’.

Among the -(X)mlčXg nominals, tägımğ ‘worthy of …’ also governs the dative (examples in OTWF 374); it does so more like a postposition than like a verb, however, as it is no longer transparent. The fact that it can govern gerunds in -gAlI (e.g. in AmitIst 58 or MaitH X 4v9) does not really make much of a difference here. Other -(X)mlčXg adjectives like ärtimğ ‘transient’, kanımğ ‘satisfied, content’ and särımğ küdımlüg ‘patient’ have no verbal government. -gA lexemes are also

265 OTWF 116 quotes passages in which küzüči ‘guarding, guardian’ governs direct objects such as yertüča ‘the world’ or ordu kapag ‘palace and gate’. In darrı arvış núdaččlarıg köğıkü kazăččlar užūn (Warnke 166) ‘because they guard and defend people who uphold spells’ an -(X)m+čI derivate of kö- and an -(U)t+čI derivate of küzüd- have the government of an accusative form in common.

266 Such phrases can, of course, also be understood as complex nominal phrases if the first element is in the stem form and not in the accusative; in section 4.121 below we discuss also nominal phrases whose head has no possessive suffix although the internal relationship is neither appositional nor adjectival, as in balık kapag ‘city gate’ or beš ažūn rindüglar ‘the beings of the five existences’. Instances as the se may, however, be set phrases, the heads of the type discussed in the present section do seem to be transparently deverbal and in a few cases the object is in the accusative case.

267 Denominal +čI forms do not, of course, govern objects.
often transparent (e.g. bilgê ‘wise person’) but none show any signs of participle-like behaviour either.

Another adjective formed from a deverbal nominal (the ‘dominant’ -Xš) with the help of +Ig is küsüslüg ‘desirous (of)’ from küsä- ‘to wish’ over küsüš ‘wish’. OTWF 273 quotes examples of küsüslüg governing the objects nom ‘dharma’, munta kutulmak ‘to save oneself from this’, burxan kutü ‘buddhahood’ and [b]o kutulug kün+üg ‘this blessed day (accusative)’. In bir kûn içintä mîn tûmân kata körğa bü küsüslüg kûlî alp kâra (HamTouen 5,64) ‘his slave Alp Kara, who wishes to see him ten million times a day’ küsüslüg governs a converb form in -gAl and in fact functions as an attributive participle of küsä-. Since this lexeme shows some verbal characteristics, one would want to derive it directly from küsä- through a composite deverbal formative; other instances of -Xš with +Ig do not, however, show any degree of fusion. Above we quoted an -(X)mlXg form governing a converb in -gAl. Derivates in -(X)nč can also govern such converbs, as sakînč < sakîn- ‘to think’ in kim kawû yar cayylarka yarangalî sakînč’in virlap taxšurup bittig bititsär, ... (U III 75,10) ‘Whichever man sings and writes verses and has letters written with the intention of currying favour with women, ...’. cayylarka yarangalî sakînč is the nominalisation of the phrase cayylarka yarangalî sakîn- ‘to plan to curry favour’. With kertgünč < kertgün- ‘to believe’ we have ic ârdnikâ kertgün köngüllüg upasi (MaitH Y 4) ‘the lay brother with faith in the three jewels’. All this shows the fuzziness of the border between lexeme formation and grammar.

-gAn is a participle and action noun suffix in most of the modern Turkic languages and is likely to have been a part of the inflectional system already in Proto-Turkic. In Old Turkic this use is either archaic, however, or else we find it in late texts, where it may have been reintroduced from other dialects; such use is mentioned in section 3.282 below. Petrified -gAn forms are tikän, yargan or bazgan, all discussed in OTWF section 3.324. Some instances of -gAn do belong into word formation, however, as they are clearly neither participles nor petrified lexemes. Such instances (dealt with in detail in OTWF section 3.324) are esnâgîn bars (IrqB X) ‘a yawning tiger (not one yawning during the event recounted in the passage)’, udîgan (Mait III 3r6) ‘(a snake) prone to sleep’, tutgan and kapgan (HamTouen 17,4-9 and 1’-6) ‘(a) rapacious (falcon)’, savî yarlıği yorîgan (Schwitz 17) ‘(somebody) whose words and commands generally prevail’, kişini tutagan268 (TT

268 See OTWF 425 for the first vowel of this verb, mentioned in the EDPT as ‘tota-’.
VII 25.6) ‘(habitually) disparaging (people)’ and the forms ungan, ḏörétgan, igidgän, kācērgān and yarətgan which are all epithets for God Eternal in the QB. Such -gAn forms clearly denote the habitual subject, a living being characterised by the activity denoted by the base. The explanation for the agentivity of this suffix and for the fact that it governs objects is probably its likely morphological origin; one could even make a case for the view that some late Old Turkic sources use it as a participle.269

Deverbal nouns are distinguished from the whole verbal system by being negated with  +sXz or analytically, whereas the former have -mA-preceding the mood, tense-aspect, participle or converge suffixes.

3.12. Nominal inflectional morphology

This is of three types. There is, first, the inflection of nouns and adjectives, the latter also getting used adverbially. Pronominal and numeral morphology, which differ from this first type, are discussed in sections 3.13 and 3.14 below. The inflectional morphology of nouns and adjectives consists of the markers of four categories, number, possession, antonym marker and case.270 Further, of a converter +kl (applied to local and temporal terms of miscellaneous shape; section 3.126) and, for Uygur, of +lXg (section 3.111 and 4.122) which, like the genitive suffix, has some converter qualities. As a further (non-inflectional) nominal category we should mention (in)definiteness, since an Old Turkic nominal can be accompanied by the indefinite article bir (distinct from the numeral ‘one’ by meaning), mentioned in section 4.1.

Rather then modifying nominals, the categorial markers discussed here in fact modify noun phrases: In közi kara+m ‘my black eyed one’ (M II 9,19), for instance, the possessive suffix is added to two words together, without these having become one lexicalised whole. There is,

269 yūğergāntā bulunuz in HamTouen 20,11 should be translated as the editor does: yūğergān ‘courier’ is documented in the DLT. This is a lexeme and not a -gAn form created ad hoc, which it was taken to be in OTWF 384.

270 +s(X)μ appears to have become a feminine marker in some words; see the end of section 3.122. The gender of terms formed with the Sogdian feminine suffix +ané, e.g. arxannten (examples in the UW entry) ‘female arhat (saint in Indian tradition)’, n(i)gošak n(i)gošakanércarka (M III Nr.27 r6) ‘to male and female auditors’, koxtirané ‘female presbyter’, šarmirané ‘female novice’ or šamrané ‘nun’ was clearly transparent to Uygur readers. The existence of a category of human gender could have been considered even though the suffix is attested only with borrowings, if there had been more examples or if they had shown greater semantic diversity.
further, the group inflection phenomenon, which concerns only nominal, not verbal affixes (but does concern the suffix +\(lAr\) also when applied to finite verb forms, as shown in section 3.23 below). In tsuy \(irinc\ul{\u0103}larrings\) (TT IV B 50) ‘my sins (acc.)’, e.g., the plural, possessive and case suffixes are added to the two synonyms (the first copied from Chinese) together. In \(bulganmi\'\)s \(talg\u{u}nm\'is\in ukup ‘noting that they are in confusion and disorder’ (AoF 20(1993): 374 r11), e.g., the nominal ending expressing both 3rd person reference and accusative case is shared by the two -\(mI\$\) forms; it agrees, of course, with the last one in synharmonism. The first word could also have had the shape \(*bulganmi\'\)s\in, but the procedure chosen by the author or translator adds cohesion between the two verbal nominals.

The morphemes expressing the four nominal categories (plus indefiniteness as non-morphological category, mentioned on the previous page) are added to their base in the order they are cited above.\(^{271}\) Number may originally have been a bit akin to derivation, in that different word classes had different plural forms. The suffixes of case, on the other hand, appear as last element in the morphological chain (unless followed by +\(kI\) to incorporate the whole morphological structure into a new nominal base). This fact is connected with their similarity, in some ways, to postpositions (with which they also share syntactic tasks). In Uygur the plural suffix can, however, appear after the possessive suffix to denote a plurality of possessors, e.g. in \(yetin\'c\) \(ugu\u{u}\u{u}mazla\rs\)b\r\l\a\ (U III 55,11) ‘together with your seventh generation’ (i.e. including the seventh generation after you). The sentence is addressed to a number of persons; this is not made clear enough by the plural possessive suffix, which is used for polite address to singular addressees. For the same reason, +\(lAr\) is added also to the plural imperative. Adding +\(lAr\) to \(ugu\u{u}\) would not, in Uygur, have expressed that the plurality is meant to apply to the possessors and not to the possessed.

\(^{271}\) ‘yer+i+l\(\u00e6\)r+d\(\u00e6\)’ with the possessive suffix preceding the plural suffix instead of following it has been read in ‘\(\u{u}z\u{u}\u{u}t\u{u}\u{u}m(\u{u})n\) siz \(kur\u{u}g\u{u}n\) tur\u{u}r\u{u}g yer\u{u}k\u{u}\u{u}r\u{u}d\u{u} oz\u{u}r\u{u}g’ (M III Nr.9 II,1 v5-7), translated as ‘meine Seele aus den finstern Ländern der greisen Todesdämonin errette Du!’; this is also quoted in Zieme 1969: 114. The third word should, however, probably be read as \(kur\u{u}g\u{u}n\) in the writing style which Le Coq here qualifies as ‘nachlässige uigurische Pinselschrift’, N and R are often similar. P. Zieme (personal communication) now reads the word discussed here as \(y\u{u}g\u{u}l\u{u}\u{u}r\u{u}d\u{u}\) and not ‘yer\u{u}\u{u}k\u{u}\u{u}r\u{u}d\u{u}’. This gives two sentences with parallel verbs: ‘Redeem you my soul and save (me) from murky enemies’. 
3.121. Number
This is a binary category, with ‘plural’ as marked member: Plural entities are commonly marked with +lAr but the absence of this element does not signify that the reference is to a singular entity.

In the runiform inscriptions, nominal plurality was expressed only with humans, and that only occasionally; the following sentence, e.g., clearly refers to all the sons and daughters of the nation: bäglik urï oğlug kal bolü, esilik kız oğlug kal bolü (KT E 34) ‘Your sons, meant to be lords, became slaves, your daughters, meant to be ladies, became concubines’. As pointed out in Tekin 2000: 102, the inscriptions apply +lAr to the social class of bäg+lär ‘the lords’ and to names for family members. According to Johanson 2001: 1728a ‘ist im Ost-Alttürkischen -lAr noch ein Kollektivsuffix’; this can hardly be the case when Köl Tegin (N9) refers to his own sisters and wives as äkä+lär+im and kunçuy+lär+im respectively. In the Yenisey inscriptions we also find kälîn+lär+im ‘my daughters-in-law’, küdägü+lär+im ‘my sons-in-law’ or kadaš+lär+îyiz ‘your relatives’.

In the Orkhon and Imperial Uygur inscriptions, the Common Turkic +lAr competes with the suffixes +(U)t, +An and +s. +(U)t (which may have been borrowed together with the bases it is used with) appears e.g. in tarkat, säüt and tegit, the plurals of the titles tarkan, sänjîn and tegin. See OTWF 78-79 for documentation and subsequent retention.272

In (post-inscriptional) Uygur, the ‘normal’ plural suffix +lAr was added unto these forms, giving the common tegitlär ‘princes’ or (in MaitH XVI 11r25) bägitlär ‘the lords’: otuz tegit oğlanî ... birlä (MaitH, colophon,24) ‘together with his 30 prince(ly) sons’ still has the simple form. +s appears only in a term borrowed from Sanskrit, iśvara+s (SU S 2), ‘potentates’. +s looks Indo-European while both Mongolic and Sogdian have plural suffixes with °n/.273 +An, the third rare plural suffix, is discussed in OTWF 91-92. It appears mainly in är+ân ‘men’, tor+an ‘system of nets’, öç+ân ‘the innermost parts’ and og(û)+an ‘sons’, e.g. in IqB LXV: amti, anrak og(û)lanîm, ança biînjîlär ‘now, my dear sons, know you thus’; the plural verb form shows that more than one

272 The suffix was mentioned as +(X)t in the OTWF but none of the instances attested with common nouns gives unequivocal proof for the identity of the vowel. The Tangut people (this name first mentioned twice in the Orkhon inscriptions) were in Tang China called Dang Xiang. I would propose that +Ut was added to this first syllable. If this was done by Turks, the vowel would be fixed as /U/. If the language was Mongolic (the plural suffix +Ud being fully productive there), Mongolic /U/ would correspond to Turkic /X/.

273 It is, I think, most likely for the suffix to have been of Mongolic origin, as only that language group had ‘n/ño as a regular representative of singular vs. plural in nominals.
person was being addressed. Note also *ogulanîm inilärim* ‘my sons and younger brothers (M III 9,5) with parallelism between the two suffixes.

The appearance of +*lAr* was in general not a matter of economy but of individuality, the height on the agentivity scale of the entity involved and, no less important, relevance: Take the passage *az inaru barm[iš], bir ögü[r] muygak kör[miš], ymä muygak sïgunug uyu[tṣu bi]lig uičün edürür ärmîš, bo bâlgü körüp ymä* ... (M I 35,7) ‘He went a bit further and saw a herd\(^{274}\) of female maral deer. A female maral deer was pursuing a male maral deer for sex. He saw this sign and ...’. The reference could also be to a number of females pursuing the males; we don’t know, as the author does not appear to have attached any importance to specifying the number. In the simile *kaltî balak (= balîk)* *suv iêrâ yüzârêä* (M I 17,14) *balîk* ‘fish’ could be either singular or plural; the translation could either be ‘as a fish swims in water’ or ‘as fish swim in water’: The difference just does not matter in this particular context. Uygur and Qarakhanid sources have the common Turkic marker +*lAr* appearing with any entities and not just with humans, e.g. *üdlär* ‘periods of time’, *täxhr mägiläri* ‘divine pleasures’, *yultuzlar* ‘stars’. Even there, however, the presence of +*lAr* is indicative of a plurality of individual entities rather than a mass (unless an Uygur translator is translating a foreign source literally).

Forms without +*lAr* could sometimes be understood as plural when no number words were around even in the wider context: *495 bodisavtlar kuvaʁçi* ‘the assembly of the 495 bodhisattvas’ but *adîn tâxhr kuvaʁçi* (in the context) ‘the assembly of the other gods’.

The honorific use of plural forms is normally limited to the pronominal and the verbal domain. Rarely, a nominal plural form can also serve this purpose: The question *tözünlär, bo körünç körüp kögüllüŋ yazîl[tî] mu* which Upatisa is asked by Kolita (ms. Mz 708 r 29:30 quoted by Zieme in *UAJb* 16: 295) signifies ‘Oh noble one! Did your heart stray seeing this pageant?’. Similary in KP 45,3, where *bodis(ay)tlar* is used in clear honorific reference to a single person (alternating with *bodis(ay)vt* two lines further on); here the person is not addressed but spoken about.

In *ApokrSû* 262, 265, 268, 271, 272, 283 and 286 we have *kuvaɾç+lar* ‘ladies’ referring to a single woman, as completely clear from the context. The note to the passage mentions Mongolic *exe+ner* denoting a (single) woman, refers to a paper by Doerfer on the category of number in Manchu and writes that it is ‘wahrscheinlich als ein

\(^{274}\) The editor writes *bir ögü[r]* (i.e. *üküš*) but *ögü[r]* seems more likely to me. If there is enough space in the lacuna, the text may have had *bir ögü[r sïgun] muygak.*
Pluralis modestiae zu betrachten”; the process concerning the Arabic term may rather have involved tabuisation, which made it improper to refer to a person’s wife directly. Deference is, at any rate, certain not to be involved in the ApokrSü passage.\footnote{The Arabic plural ‘iyâl ‘family members’, which in many Turkic languages came to signify ‘wife’, may or may not be another example for the same phenomenon: Many Arabic plurals of other semantic domains, e.g. tuğâr ‘merchants’, also acquired singular meanings in Turkish.}

Collectives are also related to plurality. Nouns and numerals formed collectives with the suffix +\(\text{(A)gU}\) (discussed in OTWF section 2.52); a common example is \(\text{adîn+agu ‘other(s)}\), attested e.g. in M III Nr. 8 V v 5 and VI r 1. In Orkhon Turkic, this form has an additional /\(\text{n}\)/ (no doubt akin to the ‘pronominal’ /\(\text{n}/; cf. next section) when further suffixes are added: We have \(\text{kâlinüm (*kâlin+(\(\text{ä}g\)ün+\(\text{üm}\)) ‘my daughters-in-law’ in KT N 9, tay+agun+\(\text{a}ğuz ‘your colts’ (KT SE)}\)\footnote{These two forms cannot be connected with Mongolian \(\text{gû’ûn} (\text{Written Mongolian kûmûn}), as T.Tekin (1968: 121) thinks, as that is not a suffix but a noun and signifies ‘person, people’; +\(\text{(A)gU}\) is by no means limited to humans or even to living beings.}}\) and \(\text{iniy+ägün+\(\text{üm}\)\footnote{iniy is the archaic form of \(\text{ini} ‘younger brother’ which still appears as \(\text{ini} in Yakut. It was thought by some that \(\text{iniyägün} is a compound of \(\text{ini} with ‘nephew’; this latter, however, is \(\text{yegûn} and not \(‘yägün. A passage in E28.8, a Yenisey grave inscription, has been read as \(\text{tört (ini)l(i)gï (ä)r(î)m(i)z; b(i)zï (ä)r(kî)g (a)d(i)r(î), by T. Tekin 1991: 357 translated as ‘We were four brothers; the god of the Underworld separated us’. This does not suit the meaning of the comitative suffix +\(\text{WXgU}\); That would have had to be translated as ‘we were with four brothers’, which does not suit the context. I take \(\text{i}\) in the first word to be a scribe’s error for \(\text{y}^2\); \(\text{iniy+ägû} would fit this context (and Tekin’s translation) perfectly. The stone does show \(\text{i}\) but the two letters are quite similar; he could have misread his handwritten source.}}\) ‘my younger brothers’ (KT S1 and N11, BQ N1).}

\section{Possession}

Here are the ‘possessive’ suffixes, which come second in the morpheme chain:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}

\hline
  & singular & plural \\
\hline
1\textsuperscript{st} person & +\(\text{X)m}\) & +\(\text{X)mXz}\) \\
2\textsuperscript{nd} person & +\(\text{X)η} - +\(\text{X)g}\) & +\(\text{X)ηXz} - +\(\text{X)gXz, +\(\text{X)ηXzAr}\) \\
3\textsuperscript{rd} person & +\(\text{(s)I(n) + (s)I(n)}\) & +\(\text{ArI(n)}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The common \(\text{t(ä)hri+m}\) is an example for the 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular possessive suffix losing its onset vowel with a stem ending in a vowel. These suffixes share the plural element +\(\text{Xz}\) with the personal pronouns \(\text{biz and siz, and the 1\textsuperscript{st} person possessive suffixes have a labial as in}

\footnote{276 These two forms cannot be connected with Mongolian \(\text{gû’ûn} (\text{Written Mongolian kûmûn}), as T.Tekin (1968: 121) thinks, as that is not a suffix but a noun and signifies ‘person, people’; +\(\text{(A)gU}\) is by no means limited to humans or even to living beings.}

\footnote{iniy is the archaic form of \(\text{ini} ‘younger brother’ which still appears as \(\text{ini} in Yakut. It was thought by some that \(\text{iniyägün} is a compound of \(\text{ini} with ‘nephew’; this latter, however, is \(\text{yegûn} and not \(‘yägün. A passage in E28.8, a Yenisey grave inscription, has been read as \(\text{tört (ini)l(i)gï (ä)r(î)m(i)z; b(i)zï (ä)r(kî)g (a)d(i)r(î), by T. Tekin 1991: 357 translated as ‘We were four brothers; the god of the Underworld separated us’. This does not suit the meaning of the comitative suffix +\(\text{WXgU}\); That would have had to be translated as ‘we were with four brothers’, which does not suit the context. I take \(\text{i}\) in the first word to be a scribe’s error for \(\text{y}^2\); \(\text{iniy+ägû} would fit this context (and Tekin’s translation) perfectly. The stone does show \(\text{i}\) but the two letters are quite similar; he could have misread his handwritten source.}
Labials in the 1st person are a universal feature, however, and do not signal any etymological connection. An etymological connection between the 2nd person possessive suffixes and the 2nd person personal pronouns – postulated by some scholars – is also quite unlikely: The former have a nasal or oral lenis velar whereas the latter ends in an alveolar nasal in the singular and has no nasal at all in the plural; nor is the onset /s/ of sân likely to have melted away in any accountable variety of Proto-Turkic. In short, pronouns and suffixes cannot be connected.

In the 2nd person the nasal and the voiced velar fluctuate in the Orkhon inscriptions, without apparent reason and even in the same phrase; e.g. el+iŋ+in törö+g+ün (KT IE22) ‘your land and your government (acc.)’. Other examples for /g/ are buŋ+ug (KT S8) ‘your worry’, üdgü+i+g (KT E24, BQ E20) ‘your profit’. The /g/ appears also in verbal forms, where it refers to the subject: bilmä-dökö+üg+ün üçün (BQ E20) ‘because of your ignorance’ (accusative form governed by the postposition), öl-sük+üg (KT S7, BQ N5) vs. öl-sük+ǖ (KT S6, BQ N5). With the preterite the oral velar is attested both in the singular and in the plural: The forms alkïntïg, arïltïg, bardïg, ärtïg, kïltïg, kïgïrtïg, körtïg, öltïg and bardïgïz are all quoted in Tekin 1968:92-93. This fluctuation is found in some modern languages as well, e.g. among the Anatolian dialects.

In some Manichaean mss., e.g. one ms. of Xw, we find that the 1st person plural possessive suffix has the form +(U)mXz / +(U)mUz e.g. tak+umuz (251) instead of takîmîz and, with the preterite form which has the same suffixes, si-dumuz (256) and bačama-dumuz (258).

We have a rare repetition of the possessive suffix in the common bir+i+si ‘one of them’; this may possibly have come about through analogy from iki+i+si ‘both of them’, in case iki / äki was felt to come (or really was) from *äk+i ‘its supplement’.

In the 3rd person singular and plural, the suffixes in the table are written with an n+ at their end; this n+ appears in brackets because it is absent in the nominative (where the 1st and 2nd person possessive suffixes serve as they are). Cf. the demonstrative pronouns, which show the same element; the personal pronouns have a related phenomenon especially in the plural domain, and cf. Orkhon Turkic +(A)gU(n). In earlier texts, the n+ of the 3rd person possessive suffixes in fact appears before all suffixes: also the antonymy and parallelism marker +lI (see section 3.123) and the suffix +IXg (e.g. in burxan kutïn+lïg ‘related to
Buddhahood’), independent pronouns. The pronominal +n+ of this suffix, lost in South Eastern Turkic from the Middle Turkic period on, gets dropped already in the dialect of the fragments in Sogdian script (san+iča, kut+ičga). Note, further, that +I(n)+ and +sI(n)+ do not function in complementary distribution in Chuvash, but that rather the cognate of +I(n)+ contracts with any stem coda vowel. What clearly is the Chuvash cognate of +sI(n)+ gets used in cases of inalienable possession, suggesting some such original set of functions also for Proto-Turkic. A single instance of the absence of /s/ after vowel in a relatively late text (süü+iŋa čärigiŋä in Suv 409,11, St. Petersburg ms.) might be considered an error (or was possibly meant to be read as sü𝑤iŋä) and not an archaism (thus also Zieme 1969: 67 against Ramstedt). +sI(n)+ is normally spelled with front n!2 and s¡ in Orkhon Turkic also when appended to back-vowel words. This suggests that it may not have been synharmonic, which, in turn, accords with the theory that it originally was an independent pronoun. The Chuvash 3rd person possessive suffix also always consists of a front vowel, which has by Benzing 1940: 251n. been linked to the Orkhon Turkic facts. It may, however, also be that the Chuvash situation is secondary, as Common Turkic +kI became +ki in Turkish, and the Orkhon Turkic fronting appears to be subphonemic: The form suv+iŋa (in BQ E40 in a binome together with yer+iŋä, ‘towards their country’) with the directive ending following the suffix is spelled with r' and w (not ū). We even find tözünlař+iŋa in lugun (spelled with X in the case suffix) in an early Manichæan text, DreiPrinz 119. See section 3.132 for forms of the pronoun *i(n). In the 1st and 2nd persons of the possessive paradigm, plurality is marked by an element +(X)z, as in the personal pronouns referring to these persons. There are numerous examples in which 2nd person

---

278 The 3rd person possessive suffix may possibly originally have been identical with the obsolete pronoun in+ discussed in section 3.132 below.
279 This is what appears from examples quoted in Benzing 1940: 253, 255 and in other publications.
280 This was first proposed by Radloff, later by Räsänen; see Tekin 1968: 18 for references.
281 Orkhon Turkic orto+iŋa is also spelled four times with r' and w, but Hesche 2001 makes a case for the view that these are instances of kùn orto ‘south’ and tùn orto ‘north’ governed by a postposition iŋa. There are no other relevant case suffixes: The dative has no oral velar but ū, for which there is only one sign in the Orkhon inscriptions. The ligature with which the locative is always spelled and the d of the equative are also used both in front and back contexts.
282 Bang, Gabain (e.g. 1974 § 71) and others took this to be an old dual suffix, stating
plural possessive endings serve polite reference to single entities, e.g. 
*yänä anvam yutzuz bolzun* (M III Nr.7 I v 5) ‘Moreover, may Anvam become your (sg.) wife’. Such plurality of politeness is not always consistent; examples like the following are not rare: 
*s(ä)ñiñ yipărîg yemîšlikìgıkä kigürüŋ* (M III Nr.9 II v 10-12) ‘Introduce me into your fragrant orchard’. 

‘Possessive’ suffixes normally express either possession or general appurtenance and assignment. In these functions, their meaning is practically identical to that of the personal or demonstrative pronouns in the genitive; see section 4.121 for examples.

Added to adjectives, the 3rd person possessive suffix can refer to the bearer of the quality in question. With verbal nominals the possessive morpheme refers to the subject of the verb, e.g. in *y(a)rîkaniñ-i üçün* ‘because he graciously (dived)’ (M III Nr.15 r 2; Wilkens Nr. 352). Thus also e.g. in *k(a)mug s(ä)vuğlärim* ‘Oh all my beloved ones!’ (ms. U 140 v3 quoted in Zieme 1969: 98), where the 1st person possessive suffix refers to the loving person. This is also what we have when we have with perfect or projection participles such as the ones ending in -*dOk* and -*sXk* respectively, as described in sections 3.283 and 3.284, and in fact in the paradigm of the constative preterite (section 3.232 below), which has been said to consist of a participle suffix involving an alveolar consonant plus the ‘possessive’ suffixes.

In *iğüš+i* ‘many of them’ (e.g. in BT II 238) there is a partitive relationship. Such expressions are used adnominally as well, e.g. in *amarîlarî tînlîgîlar* (TT X 39) ‘some of the creatures’. Similarly with the possessive suffix of *ulüq+i* in e.g. *ağ ulüqî tegin iki inilärîgî ineça tep tedi* (Suv 608, 15-17) ‘the eldest prince said to his two younger brothers’: It refers to the group of the three brothers. This is the phenomenon Grønbech 1936: 92ff. mostly had in mind when calling the 3rd person possessive suffix an article. Three examples, with *ulüqî*,

that words as *köz* ‘eye’, *köküz* ‘breast’, *tîz* ‘knee’ or *müyüz* (*buñuz*) ‘horn’, representing body parts of which men or animals have a pair, are formed with it. *ağız* ‘mouth’ was assigned to this group because there are two jaws. -*Xz* was taken to appear also in *bîz* ‘we’ and *sîz* ‘you (pl.)’, in *iğîz* ‘twin’ and in the 1st and 2nd person plural possessive suffixes. However, a number of body parts which come in pairs, such as *ulüq* ‘hand’, *kulak* ‘ear’, *ügün* ‘shoulder’ or *adak* ‘foot’, do not end in *iz*; *müyüz* ‘complexion’ ends in *iz* but is not a pair and does not consist of two parts. *köz* is probably derived from *kör* ‘to see’. In (Qarakhanid etc.) *iğîz* ‘twin’ duality is denoted by the base and not the suffix. It seems unlikely that Proto-Turkic should have had a dual, as there is none in any Turkic language or in Mongolian. Rôna-Tas 1998: 73 writes: ‘Contrary to the opinion of Erdal and others -z has never been a dual suffix or denoted pairs of body parts’; I never expressed a view different from the one formulated above.
äg ulugï and äg ’ilki ulugï respectively, are quoted in Gabain 1974: 158 (§ 360) and 398 (suppl. 56). The 3rd person possessive suffix creates contrast within a group, e.g. ulugï täŋri tep tedi and kicigi täŋri tep tedi ‘The greater one among the gods said the following’ and ‘The smaller one among the gods said the following’ in the Aranemi-Jätaka (ManOuig 1a r 1 and 8). Cf. further siŋar+i bodun içikdi, siŋar+i bodun kiri ‘Half / Part of the people submitted, the other half / part retreated’ (SU E6-7), with the possessive suffix referring to the ‘whole’. The expression anta kalmïš+i bodun ‘that part of the people which stayed behind’ is from the same inscription (N3); note that the contrastive possessive suffix is here added to a participle representing the head as subject.

The possessive suffix also has referential tasks within text structure: Take the sentence Amga korugun kışlap yazïga oguzgaru si taşıkdìmiz (KT N 8), which signifies ‘We spent the winter at the Goat reserve and, that summer, drew out with our army against the Oguz’. The possessive suffix in *yaz+ìn+ga refers back to the winter preceding the summer of the Oguz raid. The use of the possessive suffix in kenînja ‘in the end’ (Pafhl I 8) referring the the preceding narrative is similar. In yol+i, which forms adverbial multiplicatives (section 3.14), finally, such reference has become rather fuzzy.

Old Turkic (like e.g. Modern Turkish) shows switch reference, where a preceding and a following element refer to each other by possessive suffixes; e.g. tîtî+si baxš+siŋa (TT X 18) ‘the pupil (spoke) to his teacher’, atî+i+si ogl+i tapa kalmïš täg (TT X 71) ‘as when a father comes to his son’. English uses possessive marking only for the entities mentioned second, thus referring only backwards and not forwards.

täŋrim, literally ‘my god’, is a deferential way of address, like my lord, French ma-dame, Arabic sayyid+i (> sudi) etc.

The 3rd person singular possessive suffix is often used for the plural as well, e.g. inscriptional _UC käräg kîśî283 kälti, sav+i bir ‘There came three enemy deserters all submitting the same report’; süsîn anta sançdim, āvi on kän ögrä üçküp barmïš ‘There I routed their (the Karluk’s) army; their households had, it turned out, gotten alarmed and fled ten days earlier’. This was no doubt the Proto-Turkic situation, still found e.g. in Chuvash. In Uygur we find e.g. kaji xan ögi katun...

---

283 This word is based on an emendation by Radlov accepted by most scholars. The stone has something which apparently looks most like y’Lyî’, by Aalto in his edition translated as “nacheinander”. This idea, taken up by Abylmaz 2000: 107 with ‘art anda’, is impossible: Abylmaz links the reading with yîgi ‘close, compact, dense’, but xg/ is never dropped in (early) Old Turkic. We are left with Radlov’s proposal, then.
ogl+inya nache ayısar ... ‘in whatever way his father the king and his mother the queen asked their son ...’; tört maxarač täŋrilär ... oğun tizin söküp ... ayasın kavgırup ... ‘the four maḥarāja gods knelt on their right knees and joined their palms (aya+şiν)’: The praying gesture obviously involves the palms of a person’s both hands. Also in an instance with +lAr like yigi kilincılårın in Pothi 20, which should be translated as ‘their close-set deeds (acc.’, there is no need to think that +lAr actually denotes the plurality of subjects (which must be clear from the context) beside denoting the plurality of actions. The 3rd person plural possessive suffix +lAr does not ever appear to get added to the plural suffix +lAr; the instance in BT II 744 (yarlikançač köünliči kärclărı ‘their faculties of commiseration’) is isolated and should be an error. What we do have is the addition of +lAr after the 2nd person plural possessive suffix, presumably to make clear that a plurality of possessors (and not mere polite address or a plurality of possessed entities) is meant; +(X)ıy(X)zlAr is a composite plural possessive marker: tücküncılär (Pothi 366) ‘in your (pl.) presence’; ävyjnılärkä tās jlıır (Pothi 382) ‘reach (pl.) your (pl.) homes!’; [ögr]ınčın m(ā)jnîn ārmakån(ı)zl[l]är/ bolzu (M III Nr.27 r 14) ‘May a life in joy and happiness materialize for you!’; sizlınrıng ogl+an+yıγı+z+lar+nı (DKPAMPb 172) ‘your (pl., polite) children (accusative)’. The Suv, a Buddhist text, has quite a number of instances of this suffix sequence, among them birök el xan big işi bodun kara nomća törōča yorişarlar, ötrö sizlınrıng t(ā)ŋridām çoguŋızlar yalınıŋıزلär teriniŋıزلär kuvragınıزلär asılar üstälär (Suv 194,16) ‘If, however, king, lord and lady and the simple folk were to live by manners and tradition, then your (pl.) divine glory and community would thrive’ and köünlıčılärta antag sakınçınızlar tursar (Suv 2,14) ‘if such thoughts come up in your (pl.) hearts’. kilincılarnıjız ‘your (pl.) deeds’ in Suv 660,1, on the other hand, refers to the deeds of a single person addressed to as täŋrim ‘my lord’, a scaffoldız ‘your (pl.) arms’ in Suv 349,3 refers to the two arms of somebody addressed as kopda köünličı t(ā)ŋrim ‘my elated lord’. Similarly the sentence alkutetse[lıg] terin kuvraglariŋıčnzı yana nomlung yağmuruń barçanı toşgurur tükćičı sız ‘You fulfill and perfect all, all your (pl.) communities of pupils, by the rain of dharma’ (Suv 334,10) is addressed to a single täŋrim, who had ‘all’ communities listening to him.

There is no evident way for a plurality of speakers to refer each to his own ‘possessed’ entity; we have the problem in Uyugur colophons of manuscripts, where the religious merit of having sponsored the copying is by the sponsors deflected to their relatives. When such copying is
sponsored by more than one person, the formulation of the colophon is in
the 1st person plural, but in the further text the reference to relatives
of each one of the co-sponsors has to be in the singular. Thus e.g. the
first text of DvaKol, which has the subjects of the deflection speaking
in the plural (with tägindimiz ‘we have ventured to . . .’), but then has
reference to their respective mothers as anam üsdäk täyrim, anam ana
katun täyrim, anam arıq kancuy täyrim, anam tuz kiy täyrim and anam
bayan og täyrim, each time with ana+m ‘my mother’ and then their
proper name and the honorific täyri+m. In another colophon of
collective sponsorship (ms. TM 36 quoted by Zieme in his discussion of
kisi in TDAYB 1987: 306), reference to kisilärim ‘my wives’ is not to be
understood as evidence for polygamy but as each sponsor referring to
his own wife.

In the example quoted, täyrim marks real female persons, but it
appears, in late texts, also to have referred specifically to goddesses as
such: There is a minimal pair täyri ‘god’ vs. täyrim ‘goddess’ in WP
2,18 (SammlUigKontr 2): tanuk tört maxarač täyrilä, tanuk yeti äkä
baltiz täyrimlär, yüçürüki tanuk e kiči, tanuk är koja ‘Witnesses (for this
contract) are the four mahârâja gods, witnesses the seven sister
goddesses, visible witnesses Ekči and Är Toča’. In this function,
+(X)m precedes the plural suffix and does not follow it. The titles Tur-
kish han+im and Central Asian bâg+üm are also specifically feminine.
Note that äkä is ‘elder sister’ while äkäm is honorific (e.g. in Sa12,27,
SammlUigKontr). xanîm appears to be attested already in a late Uygur
graffito (PetInscr), where it follows the lady’s proper name.

Possessive suffixes can be followed by the antonym marker or, more
commonly, directly by the case suffix.

3.123. Antonymy and parallelism

After the slot for a possessive

suffix but before case suffixes there was a

slot for +lI, which marks antonyms or synonyms, elements presented as

opposed or parallel in the particular context. Entities without some such

connection are rare (a possible example for this is süli ašli kertgûnêli

üçügü ‘army, provisions and faith’ in TT V B 105). +lI nominalis are

mostly pairs but sometimes triplets; the latter are then followed by

üçügü (the collective derivate from ‘three’), the former sometimes by

iki+gü (as generally done with lists in Mongolic and late Uygur). Each

word receives +lI but they share the case ending: inili äciili (KT E 6)
‘younger and elder brothers’, torok bukalî sâmîz bukalî (Tuñ 5) ‘lean

bulls and fat bulls’ (plurality follows from the context); târsli onilî

kîltaçî ‘he who does wrong or right’ and the accusatives igidli kertüli+g
... körüp ‘perceiving lie and truth’ and önl köülü ‘appearance and essence’ are direct objects. Cf. further türili yerli-dä ‘in the sky and on earth’ and the near-synonyms üzülükli öömäkliniň ... taplagi (BT I D 250) ‘the acceptance of ending and extinction’.

3rd person possessive suffixes preceding +ll normally have the ‘pronominal’ n+: e.g. bašnilä adakölä iki yilä (Ht VII 16 b 5-6) ‘within two years, from beginning to end’ with cataphoric c +(s)ll(n+), tïltagiňli nom töznilä ikişiäni ‘both their cause and their dharma root’ 284 (Myööh B r 6), tüsnilä tïltagiňli (BT I D 279) ‘their effect and their cause’, isil özınıňli ... (DKPAMPb 380) ‘his life and ...’. The instances in the following sentence lack pronominal +n: şakimünï burxannä sâkä ulä çayylarlarlä, grïräkut tæga ulaçi adïn önä on buñul yïçältärtäkäli, adïn öñyläräta ymä y aracıña kædaççi nomlug ätöçärkä ymä äñitip öëmiş amrämišlärka ... yiäkinür määnä (Şuv 32.19-21) ‘I bow to the dharmaçäyäs and to those who have found peace in the eight great çattyas (+ll) of Buddha Şäkymuni, in the other ten corners and directions (+ll) of the earth of which the foremost is mount Grïräkäa, or elsewhere’, 285 mänä tïsämäš tül+üm+li ‘the dream I dreamt and ...’ (MaitH XIII 5r14) is an instance with a 1st person possessive suffix.

In öägülä ayïğiî kiïnëçärnäñ tïsälä i tïggäädä (BT II 925-928) ‘when the retribution for good and bad deeds arrive’ the suffix gets added to a pair of adjectives in adnominal use.

In some instances one member of a couple lacks +ll, e.g. tïrgïlärli kïnarlar îüçü saviïltıläš ‘loved by gods and kïnïras’ (ATBVP 37).

Double +ll lives on in Middle Turkic, e.g. in the Qişäşu 1-Anbïyä (Ata 2002: 68) and in modern languages.

3.124. Case
When case morphemes followed directly upon possessive morphemes, there was some fusion. There are three case paradigms, then: One for bare nominal stems and nominal stems ending with the plural suffix or +ll, a second, fused one for stems with a possessive suffix and a third

---

284 Accusative suffix +nll ‘pronominal’ (as in bïzï) in view of the shape +(A)gU(n)+ which this suffix has in Orkhon Turkic or the late Uyçur extension of +nll at the expense of +(X)g (or both).

285 There is here a tripartite classification of places; however, the third member of the series (adïn öñylärä) does not get the element +ll, perhaps because it is merely a residual and non-specific category, though it does get the locative suffix intended for all three. In Taryat E3, a runiform inscription of the Uyçur kaganate, one could, in principle, read òtükän+li tïgräs+i+li äkïn ara ‘between Ö. and its surroundings’, but òtükän élï tïgräsë élï äkïn ara could be spelled in the same way and would give a very similar meaning. T. Tekin reads Tïgräs élï, taking ’tïgräs’ to be a place name.
one for pronouns and pronoun-like nominals. As a historical development within Old Turkic, pronoun declension was extended to more and more nominal domains, presumably because a pronoun has a higher textual frequency than most nouns.

There are approximately twelve case morphemes in the pure nominal declension; examples for case forms are given in section 4.11 and its subsections. Some case forms, e.g. the ablative or the instrumental, have different shapes in different text groups; there was no point in illustrating this with different tables in this work, however, as the spelling of some sources (e.g. the runiform ones) is equivocal, and as text grouping is all but clear. Suffixes with variable shapes are the genitive, the ablative and the instrumental; the directive is not very common in Buddhist and lay texts, and the comitative is outright rare there. The $^{+}rA$ suffix has two different historical developments in different semantic and functional domains. The Old Turkic case system is thus a very rich one, even in those texts which lack one or two of its members.

The nominative case form consists of a nominal with no case marking.

The genitive suffix has two main variants: $^{+}(n)Xj$, with $/n/$ dropped after consonants, is used in the runiform inscriptions (e.g. $čor+uŋ$ in KT E32, $biŋ+uŋ$ in E33) and a few other early texts, notably runiform mss. (e.g. Blatt 2, 3 and 26 and the IrqB) and Manichaean sources ($kiššiššir(i)ŋ$ in M III Nr. 8 VII r7 (22,7)).$^{286}$ There seem to be no genitives in the inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire. An $/n/$ appearing in this way only with stems ending in vowels is not attested with any other Old Turkic suffix: This suffix may possibly prehistorically have been transferred from the pronominal declension, where there is the so-called pronominal $/n/$, by metanalysis.$^{287}$

$^{286}$ Numerous instances read as $^{+}n(a)ng$, $^{+}n(ä)ng$ by Le Coq in Manichaean texts, e.g. in M I 14 title, 16,11-12 and 17,20 can be read as $^{+}Aŋ$ instead, and vice versa. The latter reading would imply a lowering of the suffix vowel, which in fact does not happen very often in front-harmony words even in Manichaean texts.

$^{287}$ Róna-Tas 1998: 73 thinks ‘Proto-Turkic nouns probably had an oblique stem in $-n$, just as pronouns still have in Old Turkic’. As evidence for this he gives, beside the genitive suffix, an accusative suffix which he reconstructs as $^{*}-nVG$, a dative suffix $^{*}-nKA$ and an instrumental suffix $^{*}-nVn$. There is, however, no way to reduce the nominal and the pronominal accusative suffixes to any common source by any sound laws known to have held for that stage of the language, and there is no evidence whatsoever that the dative and the instrumental suffixes ever started with an $/n/$. So the genitive suffix remains by itself, and ‘oblique $-n$’ remains a purely pronominal feature
The vast majority of Uygur texts, however, show the suffix only with /n/ also after consonants, e.g. \textit{maytri bodïsavt+nï}. Exceptions, such as \textit{äv+iny yuœïya yazïnmak} ‘to sin with a married woman’, the title of the third chapter of the DKPAM, need an explanation: In this case I take \textit{ävin} \textit{yunzi}, literally ‘a woman of the house’, to be a lexicalised phrase created before the generalization of +nX\textit{y}.

\textit{Qarakhanid} has a dissipilative variant +nXg,\footnote{288 Tekin 1968: 127 mentions a single instance for a variant +Xg of this suffix from KT E25, the form \textit{bodun+ug}; while this variant \textit{may} be the result of dissimilation after \textit{nd}, the context makes it more likely for it to be a regular accusative in the accusative + finite verb construction (discussed in section 4.622 below).} \textit{Orkhon Turkic} a different dissipilative variant +Xn appearing after /ny/. We find +n\textit{Uy} in two Manichaean hymn titles, \textit{vam\textit{yãni}nug baš ‘the hymn of the god Vam’} and \textit{b(a)j\textit{y} raš(a)n ñaw(a)r ziřïf\textit{mu}nug baša ‘the hymn to god, light, power, wisdom’} (M II 9 and 10).\footnote{289 This is the shape of the genitive suffix also in Early Anatolian Turkish. Cf. the rounding in flexional suffixes presumably caused by labial consonants in some Manichaean mss. and mss. in Sogdian script (section 2.402).} Conversely, +n\textit{ñy} appears, e.g., in \textit{bayag\textit{mu}nig} in HTs III 507. Sometimes the vowel is implicit, or is spelled as a low vowel, e.g. \textit{bägnæ} in U IV A152, \textit{kiš inæ} in M I 8,15. The vast majority of instances do, however, have /X/.

In the pronominal domain, the genitive form can be expanded by other case suffixes, e.g. \textit{öz+in+ñy+çä} ‘like his own’ (M III 22, 14); it gets the plural suffix in \textit{män+in+ñy+lär ol ‘they are mine’} (U III 27,16) and has the deriviate \textit{män+in+siz} (in the common Buddhist phrase \textit{män\textit{si}niz ‘selfless’}, put into the accusative in Suv 210,21). \textit{biziñ+tä+ki+çä} ‘as in the one belonging to us’ is attested in Suv. Cf. possessive adjectives like Danish \textit{min}, pl. \textit{mine ‘mine’}, \textit{sin}, pl. \textit{sine ‘his own’}.

In Buddhist Uygur, genitives of nouns can get their head deleted and be put into the locative case form; this is either used with comparative meaning or governed by postpositions. In what follows, these postpositions are \textit{ulatï, öñyi} and \textit{artö}k respectively; in the second instance the possessive suffix inherited from the original head is retained. \textit{kul\textit{gä}k\textit{nû}g u\textit{lăi adin bĭlĭglăr ‘the other senses, (i.e.) the sense (bĭlĭg) of hearing (lit. ‘the one of the ear’) etc.’} (Abhi A 3704, referring to the senses other than the sense of sight); \textit{ădğû ayîg nomlärnîg çînzhû ĭozî ğäkûn bărmĭşlärnîgïnûdå öñjû ưrûmë} (BuddhUig II 447) ‘The \textit{užhûtû (= Chin. çînžû for this Sanskrit term) nature of good
and bad principles is not different from the one of the sugatas (ădgün, adverbial instrumental, bar-миš+lar ‘the ones who walked’). In the first case one instance of bilig (which could have served as head of kulgak+ni) is deleted; in the second one barmişlar+nï+ín+da is equivalent to barmişlar+niź+őz+inda. Similarly burxanlar+niź tînlîgarîg ... ömäki őznîngâ kaņnînga takî artok ÿçîn (Warnke 195) ‘because the Buddhas are considerate ... of the creatures even more than mothers and fathers’, where the phrase tînlîgarîg ... őmäki is deleted. Another such instance from Warnke 211 is quoted in UW 211b. Cf. further kalavink+niź+da (Suv 646,6) from the name of a bird, with in ‘voice’ to be understood from out of the context. In yarumïs ol öprikilînarîñda, ârtimi ol amtikilînarîñda (HTs VII 199-201) the word understood from the context is swo başlag ‘preface’: ‘It turns out that it overshadows those of the previous ones (i.e. the previous authors) and surpasses those of the present ones’. Instances such as baxsi+nïz+tä+kî+cä (Abhi A 3537) are comparable to Turkish adding +kI to the genitive suffix in the sequence +nIn+ki(n+) to integrate the genitive form as noun phrase without its head. Old Turkic does not, however, add +kI: In this is similar to the phenomenon which has, in connection with Romani and Hurrian, been called ‘Suffixaufnahme’, although the genitive in those languages gets the head’s suffixes also when attributive (which would be impossible in any Turkic language).

The accusative has the suffix +((X)g); as stated in Erdal 1979, this is replaced by the pronominal accusative suffix +nl in the latest Uygur sources. This happens mostly when stems end in a vowel, e.g. yanṭurkič+ni in U II 58,3, ayalar+ni in U II 46,70, yerî mà karî kišîmî in Brieffr C12, again kišî+ni in TT VII 25,6; occasionally, this suffix appears in early texts as well, e.g. savli(i)g âtöznî arta(t)dïmïz in Mait 177r7. In loans +nl appears more often and turns up at an earlier stage of the language than in native Turkic words; e.g. darni+ni ‘the incantation formula’ (< Skt. dhurañ) in U II 38,69. Nouns such as barça and tüçü ‘all’, whose use is not far from that of pronouns, have the +nl ending also in classical Uygur (e.g. in HTs VIII 21, Pothi 68).

---

290 This particular instance may possibly have been contracted from *yeriĩni mä karî kišînî ünîmišt bolgaz xâns) ‘you will have forgotten your home and your old wife’ (or relatives). But, on the other hand, this text uses a very late language, with VdV > VyV and özgû ‘other (than)’; the use of the particle mA after nouns (and not just after pronouns) is also particularly late.

291 The content of this sentence is not very clear; cf. UW 209b in section 5) of the entry for artat-.
Zieme 1991: 24-25 gives some statistics on the relative appearance of +g versus +nI in Uygur verse.

The dative suffix for substantives is +kA in all varieties and stages of Old Turkic. Irregularities occur when it follows the 1st and 2nd person singular possessive suffixes, which show pronominal behaviour; these are dealt with below. +kA is today found only in Khaladj. According to DLT fol. 537-8, the Argu used this same form; Kāšārī appears not to have been aware of any other Turkic group of his time using it beside them. Evidence for +gA, which can be assumed to have existed in early Turkic beside +kA because of Oguz and Bolgar-Chuvash +A, is exceedingly weak in Old Turkic. Based on Kāšārī’s statement and on what he takes to be evidence from Old Turkic texts in runiform script, Doerfer 1987 set up the theory that the Old Turkic dative was pronounced as +gA, and that it did not use the characters for /g/ because those were pronounced as fricatives and not stops. For that purpose he refers to both the simple dative forms and the ones appearing after possessive suffixes as we find them in the Yenisey inscriptions. We will separate the two sets of forms, to deal with the possessive forms further on. Runiform evidence is such that we practically always find +kä / +qa. This evidence is overriding also for the Yenisey inscriptions, with two exceptions: +gA appears in E11 D1, in the sentence beš yeğirmä yašïmda tavga çag kanga hardim ‘When I was fourteen years old I went to the Chinese king’, and in E45 5 in the sentence kök tågridå ângü azdim ‘(When I was sixty years old) I lost the sun in the sky’. The other runiform text in which we find a +gA dative is ms. IV in the Stein collection published by Thomsen, a short administrative (or perhaps military) letter. The dating of this text in irregular cursive characters (perhaps the only runiform ms. not written with a pen) reads beşïnc ay sâkiz yeğirmigäd ‘in the 5th month, on the 18th’. The Manichaean script

292 The fact that both bases end in /n/ may or may not be a coincidence. Doerfer thought there were +gA datives also in E40 (the Tašeba inscription) and E22. In E40, Radloff and Vasil’ev were apparently wrong in reading elgü: Kormuš in 1997: 128 reads the word as el(ijm). Kurt Wulff, in his unpublished edition of the Yenisey inscriptions, writes about the space after l: ‘svage spor, der snarest kan tyde på g’, muligvis m’ (he actually supplies drawings of all these characters), i.e. ‘weak traces, which most likely indicate g’, possibly m’. He adds: ‘Mellem dette og t’, hvor Radloff, Atlas har A, synes der ikké at have stået noget bogstav’, i.e. ‘Between this and t’, where Radloff, Atlas has A, there appears not to have stood any letter’. Vasil’ev does not actually give any photograph of this inscription, and the letter which does not exist according to Wulff and Kormuš is in his hand-drawing drawn like a miniature I and not an A. In E22, where Vasil’ev writes (a)lgä, the text actually reads âç (a)lgä y(a)l[ijm] da (thus, with an erroneous : before the locative suffix), i.e. ‘when I was 42 years old’. 
distinguished between /k/ and /g/ when appearing both in front and in back syllables. Again the overriding majority of examples shows *caph* or *coph*, but the texts occasionally write G / G: We find *üdıgā* in M III Nr.12 v 3, e.g., and *ātkā kanga* ‘concerning meat and blood’ in Wilkens 2000 Nr.65 r 1. In *bastian* (thus) *adaka tāgi kanka iriŋā iŋgānip* ‘besmirched in blood and pus from head to foot’ (M I 5,14) we find the two velars simplified in *adak+ka* and the suffix velar assimilated to the nasal of *iriŋ* in what is spelled as ‘YRYNNG’. In TT VIII (Brāhmī) there are 63 instances of *k* as against 3 spelled with *g* (which is well within the limits of normal error found in Uygur Brāhmī mss.). The (original version of) the Arabic script as used for writing Qarakhanid does not distinguish between /k/ and /g/ in front syllables, but back syllable words consistently use *qāf* and not ghain for spelling the dative both in the DLT and the QB. Ghain was, of course, a fricative, while *qāf* may have been pronounced as a voiced and not an unvoiced uvular stop in Arabic dialects even in Kāšgārī’s time. So Qarakhanid evidence does not contradict Doerfer’s theory that the dative suffix was pronounced with a voiced and not an unvoiced uvular or velar stop; but he may possibly be right even as far as Old Turkic is concerned: The so-called voiced characters may not generally have been used as they in fact indicated voiced fricatives and not stops. Just possibly (but by no means necessarily), a stop [g] (as against a fricative) could also be meant when using K. Doerfer’s theory would also explain the Proto-Oguz, Bolgar-Chuvash and general Middle Turkic emergence of +gA as the dative voiced stop, which the phonemes /k/ and /g/ could be sharing in that it might have existed as variant in the word (or syllable) onset for the latter and in all other positions for the former, might have served as pivot, getting at first (at the Old Turkic stage) generalised from the post-vocalic position to all positions, and then receiving (after Qarakhanid as far as Eastern Turkic is concerned) the fricative variant beside it. But there is very little in the Old Turkic documentation to speak for this view. Another possibility is that +kA was primary and that the emergence of +gA is due to the influence of the directive suffix (which always had /g/ and was not related to the dative).

Old Turkic has no +A or +yA dative, as maintained again and again by Gabain 1974: 87 and others, especially T.Tekin 1996a, who intend these to be linked with one of the Mongolic suffixes serving as

---

293 A form ‘čaplarga’ which is in Doerfer 1993: 49 said to appear in Džumagulov 1971: 111 is in that work found neither on that page nor in the index nor in the section devoted to the dative.
It cannot be excluded, however, that Mongol copied an +A dative from a Turkic language of the Bolgar group. Doerfer 1977 had tried to explain the fact that the dative forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular personal pronouns are back vocalic (see section 3.131) by assuming that the dative suffix was originally a noun *ka, which later became a suffix. When Johanson 2001: 1726a makes the unwarranted statement “Im Ost-Alttürkischen war ... das Dativsuffix +qa ein hinteres Suffix” he is presumably following this quite hypothetical proposal concerning Proto-Turkic.

The locative suffix +dA serves also in ablative use in the earlier part of our corpus; see the ablative below. The distribution of the two sets of alveolar characters in the Orkhon inscriptions is documented in T.Tekin 1968: 133: It turns out that d1 and d2 are here more general than with the constative preterite: t1 and t2 are here the rule only when the stem ends in /n/ with /l/ generally followed by the D runes like the other consonants. We also find köl+tä ‘at the lake’ with t2 in ŞU S6. The rule holds also for pronominal forms spelled as bunta, anta and bizintä. r2(I)g2y2r2tA (KT S13 twice) is an exception if correctly understood as ārīg yertä: a number of other instances of yer get /d/ in the locative suffix. kćn+d2A in Küli Čor may be another exception, or this place name may have had a vowel after the /n/. Twice ölümtä oz- in IrqB 49 and ayakïmtä idïštä in IrqB 42 are also against this rule. In Manichaean sources (as documented in Zieme 1969: 112-114) we find the spelling with T in çaydanïa, eltä, xanïa, orontä, yolïa, aţanïa, kőğülïa, tuholmïa and often after the possessive suffix +(s)ln+ and in pronouns, i.e. again after /n/. Here the exceptions are yerindä in M III 8 I v1 on the one hand and yertä (as in Orkhon Turkic) in TT II,2 10. In

---

294 The datives adaka and sussamaka mentioned by Gabain show the very common simplification of velars, and the +yA forms mentioned there appear to belong to the directive-locative case as described below. The first word in inscriptional biğa baši refers to some military unit which may (or may not) be related to biy ‘thousand,’ but Old Turkic does not, in any case, use adnominal datives. aça in TT IIA 37 is the converb form, as correctly noted in UW 37b.

295 This is Johanson’s name for what we have called Old Turkic (which is, of course, documented best form the eastern part of the Turkic world).

296 Here, in T.Tekin 2000: 77, 115 and in glossaries of all the reeditions of the Orkhon inscriptions by T.Tekin, he mentions an instance of yertä also in BQ N15; no such word occurs in this line in any of the editions I have looked at, and I have not come across it anywhere else in that inscription. It may, however, appear in Tuñ 47 according to some readings.

297 Erdal 1997a: 69 mentions IrqB irregularities also for the constative preterite.
the Pothi book, which is a late text, the rule is not observed; nor is there any rule in Brâhmî sources. In Qarakhanid mss. we generally find voice assimilation, i.e. +tA after voiceless consonants and +dA otherwise; but cf. īš+da in DLT fol. 402.

The ablative suffix appears as +dIn in most Uygur sources, where +dA serves as locative only, as well as in Qarakhanid. The variant +dAn, today found everywhere except modern Uygur, is attested in preclassical and/or Manichaean texts, e.g. as oğûzdân or süzdân. In these sources, the alveolar is generally spelled as D except after /h/ and /h/. There are examples also twice in BT V 172 and in 501 (tägîlîrdân), DreiPrinz 96 (jîglîrdân). M I 5.13 (baštan, an exception in the spelling of the alveolar). 7.2 (iğaçdan), 17.19 (töpödân) 22,4, 7,2 (tägrîdân and yerdân) and M III 28,8, (yerîndân) and 42,17 (tägrîlîrdân). The DLT ms. has both +dIn and +dAn, e.g. suv arîktîn kardî (fol. 525) ‘The water overflowed from the canal’ vs. kul täbîn (with dâl, not dhâl) korktî (fol. 627) ‘The worshipper feared God’; both the I and the A of the suffixes are by the first hand.298 The vowel of +dAn may have been taken over from the locative suffix +dA by analogy, or, conversely, the most common variant +dIn may have come about secondarily, through influence by the orientational suffix which has a similar shape when not rounded. These appear to be morphological variants, but in Manichaean texts +dAn could also be part of the (phonological, phonetical or merely graphic) lowering of vowels also found in this group of sources. Zieme 1969: 177-8 brought together the evidence for ablative meaning in Manichaean texts. It turns out that most of them do not have any ablative suffix and use the +dA suffix for ablative content. Some have +dAn as quoted above, but +dIn is rare in Manichaean sources: The only ones which have it (and no +dAn) are the Pothi book and the passage M I 29-30 (which is a very late reader’s addition to a text). In the runiform inscriptions, e.g. in kand(a)n ‘from where’ in KT E23, the vowel of the suffix is never explicit.299 However, in Oguzdûndan (Tuñ 8) ‘from the direction of the Oguz’, where it is added to the orientational suffix +dXn, both suffixes are spelled without explicit vowel: This means that the inscriptive ablative suffix has to be read with A, because its vowel

---

298 In their grammatical sketch, Dankoff & Kelly 1985: 323 tacitly change this last instance to tägrîdân. In fol. 574 the ms. (first hand) has buzûnd ‘from the ice’ with ablative meaning, by the editors again changed to ‘buzdîn’.

299 In this and in all the runiform examples of the ablative to be mentioned here, it follows an /n/ and is spelled with the ligature, so that its alveolar must be [d], to be assigned to the /d/ phoneme.
would (after a rounded vowel) have had to be explicitly spelled as I if the inscription had had the ablative suffix as $+dIn$; whence I prefer the reading $+dAn$. Following this logic I read тaшïñдан ‘from the outside’ in a runiform inscription of the Uygur kaganate, ŠУ 84 (twice), although the last vowel is again implicit. The same sequence of suffixes is found also in ěшïн kalïñdan and ěшïн kudï in M III Nr.8, VII r 4 and v 10 respectively and in ěшïн enîp ‘coming down from above’ (1.10 in a Manichaen hymn edited by Wilkens in UAjb N.F. 16). In those early texts, where the locative form also has ablative meaning, the ablative form itself appears to be used mainly after $+dXn$. Among Buddhist texts we find $+dAn$ in the Säkiz Юкмäк Yarok edited in TT VI; the London scroll (as documented in Laut 1986: 87) has it as täpï yerïntän 8 times in 406-416, as kün ay täpïdän (404) and taloy öçïzïdän (44). Similar to Manichaen texts the London scroll of TT VI has no instances of $+dIn$ and ablative meaning is normally covered by the suffix $+dA$. The Mait, an extensive pre-classical text, has no $+dAn$ but only $+dIn$ (e.g. tamudïn in MaitH XX 1-4v1). Laut 1986: 70, 77 notes that the Hami ms. of this text has only $+dIn$ in ablative meaning whereas the Sängim ms. shows $+dA$ in ablative meaning beside $+dIn$.

The shape of the instrumental suffix changed from fourfold to twofold harmony in the course of the development of Old Turkic: We find $+(X)n$ in the runiform inscriptions and in most Manichaen instances, but other sources have $+(I)n$. This alternation can also be seen as related to a dialect difference, but that is less likely in view of the fact that petrified $+(X)n$ forms are found in Buddhist sources as well. There are, e.g., dozens of examples of ùdïn from ùd ‘time’ in the Suv. The difference is, of course, visible only when the base has a rounded vowel. We have okïn (KT E36) ‘with an arrow’, bo yolïn (Tuñ 23) ‘by this way’, küzïn (ŠУ E8) ‘in autumn’, korugïn (KT N8 & BQ E31) ‘at the reserve’, biltökümïn ödökümïn (KÇ S3) ‘with what I know and remember’ and so forth. In Manichaen sources we find ùdïn (often) ‘at a (particular) time’, sözïn (Xw 102 in ms. A; sözïn in B and J) ‘with words’, özïn (Xw 111 and 112; in Xw 149 ms. B against özïn in A and C) ‘with a (particular) identity’, köngülïn (Xw 149 and 157, M

300 What has by the editors been read as тaшïтïñ çïлïп ‘coming from outside’ in MaitH Y 164 could as well have been тaшïтïñ çïlip; the suffix $+dIln$ has till now appeared only in pronouns.
301 The instance in antï otro oguz kopïn kültï (Tuñ I S9) could possibly be translated as ‘thereupon the Öguz came in their entirety’, with the possessive suffix $+(s)I(n+)$ before the instrumental ending.
III Nr. 15 r 17) ‘by the heart’, közin kulkakïn tilïn âlgïn adakîn (Xw 207 both ms.) ‘by the eyes, the ears, the tongue, the hand, the foot’, âsrökïn (M I 6, 16) ‘by drunkenness’, körkïn (M III Nr. 7 III v 12, BT V Nr. 25 v 11-12, ms. U 128a in BT V n. 574 = Zieme Sermon v 5) ‘by shape’ or ögrünçïn (TT II, 1 66) ‘with joy’. Here and in many additional examples, Manichaean texts generally have +(X)n unless there is parallelism with stems in unrounded vowels (as in Xw 207 just quoted); Zieme 1969: 177 has brought together the (limited) Manichaean evidence for +(I)n: Only the Pothi book, the Yosipas fragment and one of Afrin Çor’s poems (M II 7-9) have +(I)n (and no +(X)n). In the DLT we find fourfold-harmony instrumentals such as köz+în ‘with the eye’ and kögï+în ‘with the heart’. Buddhist texts (where the instrumental is also exceedingly common), on the other hand, consistently have +(I)n; otlïn suvïn (MaitH XX 13r10) ‘with fire and water’ or ötüglügin (HTs VIII 68) ‘by having requests’. heltun ‘with an axe (balto or baltu)’ (MaitH XV Nachtr 3r 26) is an example of the suffix ‘es being added to a stem ending in a vowel.

alkugun and kamagun ‘altogether’ are instrumental forms put to adverbial use. The instrumental suffix was also added to the postpositions bi(r)lä and örï: Originally it probably applied to the postpositional phrase as a whole, putting it to adverbial use; in late Uygur, however, bi(r)län becomes a variant of bi(r)lä. birökin ‘however’ (MaitH XV 3v 4) shows the particle birö with the instrumental suffix. It appears, further, to have been added to the comitative case suffix +IXgU / +IXgU and to the converb ending -mAtI. The etymology of the converb endings -(X)pAnXn and -(X)pAn may possibly be linked to a demonstrative instrumental as may the imperative form -zUnIn (as explained in sections 3.231 and 3.286). The sequences +sXn and -(X)nçXzXn are also common: The instrumental suffixes...

---

302 The noun in körgün (thus, with G, in Manichaean script) tägšürûp of U 128a v 5 is not an error for accusative körk+în (facal, clear): körkïn tägšïl- in BT V 574 shows that the instrumental is appropriate.

303 ulug ünin üntüdä mägraðî (M III Nr. 3 v 12) could possibly be understood as ‘He shouted and bellowed with his loud voice’ with the possessive suffix before the instrumental.

304 The statement in Johanson 1988: 142 that ‘It is a well-known fact that the Old Turkic instrumental in {(X)n} already ceases to be productive in Uighur’ is certainly misguided; cf. also section 4.1110 below.

305 Not instances of a suffix +(k)ûn, +(g)ûn etc., as proposed in Gabain 1974 § 50. The other forms mentioned in that paragraph belong to the collective suffix +(A)gU which is used in runiform inscriptions with the pronominal n; but pronominal n appears only before case suffixes (and is not attested with this suffix outside those inscriptions).
suffix is often added to the privative suffix +sXz (and to -(X)nēsXz) as well as to its opposite +lXg when they are put to adverbial use. The suffix -(X)pAn clearly related to -(X)p and front low forms in early texts as ärklig+än and siziks(i)z+än in TT VI 90 and 305 respectively make it possible that there was an early variant of the shape +An as well.

The equative suffix is +èA. It is unstressed in modern languages and presumably was so in Old Turkic as well. The element +èl+/+èU+ found in some personal and demonstrative pronouns and in bulīrīlāyu / bulīrīlāyu yîg- (HTs III 637 and V 320) appears to come from +èA+lAyU through a process of vowel raising; see section 2.401.

The directive in +gArU, signifying ‘towards’ is very much alive for both nominals and pronouns both in Orkhon Turkic and in Manichaean texts but is not too common in the rest of Uygur (which is generally later); cf. navgağaru (BQ E35) ‘towards China’ or kängäru ‘southwards’ (TT V A71). ilğäru ‘eastwards’, e.g. in KT E 2, ŞE E8 and often elsewhere, and apa tarkangaru (Tuñ I N10) ‘to A.T.’ show that runiform inscriptions did not spell the velar of this suffix as K after l(n) (I am not aware of any example with r(n)). The scarcity of +gArU in Buddhist Uygur and Qarakhanid Turkic can be explained as a reduction of the case system in the course of historical development, but another explanation is possible as well: The shape of the directive is identical with the vowel converb of denominal +gAr- verbs (OTWF section 7.53), and may well come from it. With +lAyU we have another example of a secondary case form which we find to be already well established in Orkhon Turkic. There is no doubt about the relationship between taš+ik- ‘to go out’ and taš+gar- ‘to get out’, iç+ik- ‘to go in’ and iç+gär- ‘to get in’ and we know that petrified converbs of causatives lose the causative meaning of their source (OTWF passim). bir+ik- ‘to gather at a place’ and birgär- (OTWF 767) are highly likely to be related to birgäri ‘into one place’, which has directive meaning. This latter, içgäri and tašgaru are among the most common of directive forms in the whole of Old Turkic. So it might just be that the absence of a living directive in Buddhist Uygur should not be explained by loss but by limited evolvement in a particular dialect. A third possibility is that the directive came from contamination between such petrified converbs.

There is no diminutive or intensive suffix of this shape in Old Turkic, as professed in Gabain 1941: 59; the only two examples in her § 45 which do have this meaning among the ones mentioned do so by virtue of the base or some other suffix. The Ottoman diminutive suffix +èA was borrowed from Modern Persian.
CHAPTER THREE

and the pronominal dative in +gAr; note that Tuvan has (or had in the last century) such directives as puruAr ‘forwards; to the east’, soñAr ‘back; to the west’ and kängAr ‘towards the sun’. Deictic directives such as iÇgëAr ü, asÇgAr, öñÇAr and artÇgAr (‘in, out, forwards, backwards’) survive into Middle Turkic.

Some scholars thought they could identify the first syllable of +gArU with the dative suffix and the second syllable of the suffix with the suffix +rA dealt with straightway; others have even treated +gArU and +rA as one suffix. However, the velar of the dative suffix is shown to belong to the phoneme /k/ wherever the script used is explicit enough for this purpose, with quite few exceptions; the velar of the directive, on the other hand, consistently belongs to the phoneme /g/ in runiform, Arabic and other writing systems.307 The vowel of the second syllable of +gArU is different from that of the well-attested case suffix +rA. The only things the two suffixes share are the general local content on the semantic side and the sound /t/ as to phonic shape; they are quite distinct also in their historical development. Still other scholars (among them Gabain 1974, Clauson in the EDPT and now Hesche 2001: 53) believe in the existence of a directive suffix +rU: It is supposed to have appeared in kerü ‘back’, bärü ‘hither’, +(X)mArU (1st person sg. possessive directive), tapa+rü ‘towards’ (adverb and postposition in DLT fol.473, QB 521 and 5830 in all three mss. and in two other instances only in the late A ms. and in Middle Turkic as documented in Hesche 2001: 54) and, as proposed by Hesche 2001, in a postposition sëgaru which he derives from sëgar ‘direction’. I would take both of these words to come from the putative pronoun which became one of the two allophone clusters of the 3rd person possessive suffix +(s)In+, sëgar being similar to the datives aqar and muqar. taparu, apparently created secondarily out of a need to make the directive content of the postposition tap-a ‘towards’ explicit, is not, however, attested in Old Turkic proper. The suffix +(X)mArU being formed in similar manner as dative +(X)mA and bärü not having an obvious base, we would be left with kerü as the only word in which +rU would be early. I take that as well to come from *ke+gärü.

There are two different functions of +rA in Old Turkic, and they differ in their historical development: The directive-locative in +rA is attested

307 What has been read as yagïkaru in DLT fol.310 and translated as ‘towards the enemy’ in fact contains a verb kar- ‘to oppose’, the base of the verb for which the DLT gives the example iki büglär karïštï ‘The two begs quarrelled and fought’; this, in turn, is the base for karï ‘adversary etc.’. The ms. spells yagï and qaru separately.
only with a limited set of nominals: We find it e.g. in öryä ‘to the front (or east)’, kesrä³⁰⁸ ‘to the back (or west)’, tašra ‘outside’, ičrä ‘inside’, asra ‘below’ (see the UW for the latter).

Then we have the use with body parts, e.g. in töpörä ‘on the head’ (e.g. in Suv 7,22, 620,18, 627,3), here called partitive-locative. Examples for this in section 4.1107 show that, as partitive-locative, +rA did clearly stay alive in Uygur. +rA appears to have been incompatible with possessive suffixes in either use, though both uses were bivalent: The directive-locative, being deictic, was inherently linked to the place and time of speaking, while the partitive-locative applied only to inalienable parts of a creature’s body.

Directive-locative +rA was dissimilated to +yA when the stem had an itl: beriyä ‘in/to the south’, yirya ‘in/to the north’, kuriya ‘in/to the west’ < *berira, *yirra, *kurira; cf. Orkhon-Turkic kuriɣaru, b’riɣ’rũ of the Uygur Steppe Empire Taryat inscription (W5) and the like. üzä ‘above’ could possibly also have been formed in this way, as one source of Old Turkic ɬ/u/ is Proto-Turkic *ry; its base could have survived in Chuvash vir ‘upper’.³⁰⁹ The variant +yA cannot be connected with the dative suffix, as has been thought by some,³¹⁰ both because of the different meanings of the forms and because +kA often appears in the same phonotactic surroundings as +yA. All the instances of +yA are, like directive-locative +rA, petrified and lexicalised. Most important, the meanings and functions of +yA and the directive-locative fit together perfectly.

The simulative suffix +lAyU no doubt comes from the vowel converb of denominal verbs ending in +lA-. However, it is a full-fledged case already in the Orkhon inscriptions (meaning that there needn’t have been a +lA- verb to have served as base for every +lAyU form attested); we there find it in the expression op+layu täg- ‘to attack like a threshing ox’. Cf. OTWF 408-409, where much of the documentation is quoted; +lAyU does not seem to appear in any Manichaean source. Clauson 1962: 146 is wrong in thinking that it is ‘usually, perhaps always, attached to the name of an animal’, although there is such a group of instances.

³⁰⁸ Possibly from *ke+sin+rũ, from a stem attested in ke+n, ke+din, ke+č, ke+ča and kerũ (=< *ke+gerũ).
³⁰⁹ All directive-locative items turn out to appear in opposite pairs and üzä would be the counterpart of asra. Another cognate is üstün, discussed in this section.
³¹⁰ E.g. Tekin 2000: 79. That +yA may have been a secondary form of +rA was assumed already in the EDPT (p.XL) and is argued against by T.Tekin 1996a: 330-31.
In +cUlakU in yağalıq süö bulitčuklayu yığgay män (HTs V 320) ‘I will amass an army of elephants like a cloud’ and, again as bulitčuklayu (thus!) yığ-, in HTs III 637 +AfU appears to have joined a variant of the equative suffix. Another instance should probably read in kapil(a)vas[tudin] kür[ä]gčuläyü ünüp (MaitH I 2v21) ‘leaving Kapilavastu like a fugitive’. The personal and the demonstrative pronouns also have forms with this extended suffix +cILAyU / +cULAyU (sections 3.131 and 3.132).

The comitative +IXgU is rare and early; it has not turned up with pronouns. We find it in ini-liğiü and (eki üč kiši)+liğiü311 in the Orkhon inscriptions. This form has been linked to the Yakut comitative and to Mongolian +IugA in Gabain 1974: §424312 and Zieme 1969: 254 (n. 682), later also by Tekin 1991 (who lists all known instances) and Stachowski 1995, the last three arguing against other etymologies.

In Manichaean sources the comitative has the shape +IUrUn; examples with unrounded bases are given in section 4.1111. Another instance with unrounded base is iki kulug el[iɡ]lar kamag tegilärin kunčuy[lar]ın tözümlärinlugun (DreiPrinz 119) ‘the two blessed kings together with all their princes, wives and retinue’; not (for some reason) adhering to palatal harmony makes it similar to a postposition. Furthermore, the case suffix is here shared by three nouns. The form of the suffix in the instance š(i)mmlärinlugun ‘with the devil’ (Xw 4) is therefore no doubt also to be interpreted as +IUrUn, although its first vowel could here also have been taken to be /X/ (since the base ends in a rounded vowel). The Manichaean variant shows comitative +IUrU followed by the instrumental suffix +(X)n: The use of the comitative appears to have been getting forgotten, demanding an expansion with a well-known case suffix of similar meaning. The Yakut comitative +IX:n clearly comes from the same expansion. Mongolian +IugA is better linked with +IXgU than with +IuğU(n), as Mongolian /U/ corresponds to Turkic /X/. Whether ortok+lugu in M I 12,10 (translated as ‘teilhabend’ in Zieme 1969: 120) is an instance of this suffix is not certain: The context ol ädgü mänjikä ortoklugu bolayan ‘May I participate in that good happiness’ makes it possible that this is a variant of the suffix +IXg. Scholars like Ramstedt and Poppe linked Mongolian +IugA to the Turkic formative +IXg, which is possible as

---

311 The brackets indicate the scope of the suffix.
312 She does not list the form among the case forms, because she takes the forms with +n to be instrumentals from +IXg. She also mentions an alternant ‘+ilg’ (which she may have thought to contain the possessive suffix) not known to exist.
well. But then, it cannot be excluded either that +IXg and +IXgU have a common origin, their meanings not being all too different: A split could possibly have taken place through the specialization of +IXg in word formation. If this is indeed so, then ortoklugu in M I could be the missing link between them.

An orientational formative +dXn appears e.g. in üstün köktä altün yagı̄zda (MaitH XX 1r5) ‘in the blue (sky) on high and on the brown (earth) below’. It should be distinguished from the ablative case ending, although the distinction can be difficult to make in practice: They look identical when added to unrounded stems. +dXn is added only to the pure stem (i.e. never after plural and possessive suffixes) and is itself capable of bearing these two suffix classes; e.g. öndünü ‘its eastern side’ (Tariat W5) or sugçew taštını̄nta ‘outside Suchou’ (ManBuchFr II 2v5) with possessive suffix. In ićtınziz (TT VIII A 4) it precedes a formative. It is therefore not a case suffix in the strict sense. One reason for mentioning it here (and not among the formatives of section 3.111) is semantic; another one is that it is often difficult to tell apart from the ablative. Appearing in all Old Turkic texts, +dXn is in Uygur applied to a limited number of deictic nouns such as ‘north’, ‘east’, ‘inside’, ‘left’ or ‘behind’. It has fourfold vowel alternation in all runiform sources and in Manichaean texts, except the late Pothi book, which writes koptın ‘everywhere’. Pañc 192 also has +dXn in pronominal kanyudun ‘in which direction’, which is clearly archaic also as ń is still unchanged here. In Buddhist Uygur this suffix can appear as +dIn even in early texts, making it identical with the ablative in shape; e.g. yaguk+tı̄n+kı̄ kop kanaq tı̄nlı̄glar ‘all creatures which are near’ (MaitH XV 2v6), kın togsukdınkı̄ (MaitH XV 1r2) or törtdın yı̄yak (MaitH XX 1r11, 17, Pfahl III 9 etc.) ‘in all 4 directions’. Cf. on the other hand öndün kün tǖn buluyda TT I 142) ‘in the south-east (or ‘in the east and in the south’) or kı̄ra suvdun yerlärim (Sa12,3 in SammlUigKontr 2) ‘my land, both fallow and beside water’.

Some opaque +dXn forms were metanalysed in later varieties of Turkic. Such is üstün ‘above’ < *üz related to (or coming from) üzü

---

313 Cf. also öndün inđa ‘in its east’ in Sa9,2 and Mi20,6 in SammlUigKontr 2. The glossary to this work appears to consider kündün+i / kündin+i and ögên+i attested there in Sa10, 13 and 16 to be abbreviations of kündün / ögên yı̄yak ‘its southern / eastern side’. There is no need to make this assumption, although the two types of expressions can clearly alternate: Possessive suffixes are often used relationally.

314 We spell the word with ny and not ń as we reserve the use of ń to the runiform and Indic scripts, which have such a letter.
‘above’, wrongly given a stem “üst” in the EDPT; it is still spelled as üztün in the early Manichæan hymn edited in UAJb 16: 221-2 (1.10).\(^{315}\) Qarakhânid astïn ‘beneath’ is related to asra and wrongly given a stem “ast” in the EDPT and altïn ‘lower’ al < ‘place beneath’ (attested in M III 37,4), wrongly given a stem “alt” in the EDPT.\(^{316}\) orton, e.g. in ıkı orton ãrðâk < ‘the two middle fingers’ (TT V 8,55) or orton ânîtkâk elindâ ‘in the realm of central India’ (HTs VII 1791 & 1891) comes by haplogy from orto+dan, attested in M III 10,12-13 (an early text); the meaning makes it highly unlikely that it should be an instrumental form. Cf. also orton+kî (e.g. Suv 134,1-2, BT VIII A 377 and 382, Maue 1996 24 Nr.9) ‘the one in the middle’; +kî is not added to the instrumental. Some of the +dXn nominals have +dXrl forms (discussed in section 3.31) related to them, which have ablative meaning.

To sum all this up, Old Turkic nominals had the following 11 active and productive case suffixes: nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, locative, ablative, instrumental, equative, directive (fully productive only in runiform and Manichæan Old Turkic), partitive-locative and simulative. The comitative, a 12th case, is neither active nor productive and absent from pronoun paradigms. The demonstrative pronouns also lack the partitive-locative, the personal and the interrogative pronouns both this and the instrumental. The interrogatives further lack the simulative and the personal pronouns fuse the equative with the simulative. The demonstratives thus have 10 case forms, the other pronouns 8; this is different from Indo-European languages, where pronouns generally have more cases than nouns. The appearance of pronouns in the directive case is limited to early texts, as with nouns.

3.125. Possession + case
Examples for case suffixes getting added onto possessive suffixes are könl+üğ+cä ‘according to your wish’ (Tuñ 32), sözinügü(ü)ñ (Xw 2) ‘with their words’ and oglan+înjî+dä ‘among your (pl.) children’ (KT SE). In the Sudžî inscription (1.9) we have the stretch

\(^{315}\) An etymology for âçä is proposed earlier in this section in connection with the suffix +rA.

\(^{316}\) Clauson received this view from Gabain 1950a, who took ‘alt, art, ast’ etc. and even köt ‘buttocks’ to be instances of a (nonexistent) “-t-Kasus”. Cf. also aldîrî and âleçâk. The UW (entries al III (? and all(a)şp) does not trust the reading kum alîp tîflîn- in M III which is said to be ‘zerstört’ and would like to assign the word to the lexeme alög. However, the present loss of the word’s fourth character may not have taken place when Le Coq read it (as he does not mark it), and one would rather expect kumlag alatf if the word were not to have a possessive suffix.
wg₁¹n'm:r²d²Amr₁mr’ēA:b'wl¹,; no doubt correctly understood as oğlanım, ārđā mar⁺im’in⁺ça bol ‘My sons, be among men like (or ‘in accordance with the precepts of’) my teacher!’. If this interpretation is correct, the equative suffix was here added to the accusative form of the possessive suffix, as happens with pronouns.

In the nominative, the final /n/ of the 3rd person possessive suffix is subtracted (as also happens with the nominative of the demonstrative pronoun bo/bun- and, in Orkhon Turkic, with the collective suffix +(A)gU่น).

The same appears to happen in the instrumental, e.g. in anta őtṛö oğuz kop+i+n kālti (Tuņ 16) ‘thereupon the Oguz came in their entirety’: Thus upon the assumption that this inscription, like all other early texts, has the +(X)n and not the +(I)n variant of the instrumental suffix,³¹ eight (ā)yri ... k(ā)ntū y(a)r’ok’in k(a)maga y(a)r’otīr (M III 7 I r 9) ‘The sun … shines on everything with its own light’, could also have the possessive followed by the instrumental suffix, but yarokën could, in this context, just as well be an accusative form. Also in yarλikan❝üi köλı ... yarλikayur ‘he decrees with his compassionate mind’ (Mait 26A r 8), assuming that this is to be analysed as köğl+i+n. Gabain 1974: 98 mentions “ködügi+n” (she means küdüg+i+n) as an example for the possessive-instrumental sequence. In muntakî yörügçä bişransar yörışarlar adakların īrkılmätin ārđinilig vajïr tagka axđingalï uyur (BT I A: 16) ‘If they live by this doctrine, they will be able to climb the jewel-vajra mountain without treading (on it) with their feet’ one might want to assume the presence of a possessive suffix after +lar but this is not certain. The instances in pr(a)tikabut körkin kurtulgu tıntıqlar ārsär (U II 17,28) ‘If they are creatures to be saved through the appearance of a pratyeka-buddha, …’ and kunçaylarrın isiz yawax sakınçën ... braxmadate elığkä yalgenturur ārdı (U III 54,11) ‘with women’s bad and vile thoughts’ can only be instrumentals. In the Manichæan (and presumably early) fragment U 139 r3 edited in the note to BT V 175, on the other hand, we find the instrumental ending

³¹ This is the editor’s proposal. The Aramaic word mar ‘master’ appears also in 1.7 of the same inscription, where it can hardly be understood in any other way. The term was in Central Asia used both by Nestorians and Manichæans, and the royal Uygur dynasty of (present-day) Mongolia had adopted Manichæism. Buyla Kutlug Yargan, who speaks in the 1st person in this epitaph, says that his father was a Kirghiz, but he probably served the Uygur Yağlakir dynasty and not its Kirghiz vanquishers.

³⁸ We understand the front N in the spelling “kpn²” to indicate the presence of the 3rd person singular possessive suffix. This n may, however, also be a simple error (of which this inscription is not free) for n₁, in which case the word would simply be kop+i+n.
added to the full form of the possessive suffix: *yarojk täpri küçinin etmişi [örgin üzü orlotti] ‘He sat on the throne which the Light God had created with his might’. 319

With the genitive marking, the *n is a simple one also in that variety of Old Turkic which keeps the initial *n of this suffix after consonants: The shape of the sequence is *(s)n*<sup>319</sup> or *(s)n*<sup>5</sup>...<sup>5</sup>_<sup>5</sup>_<sup>5</sup>...<sup>5</sup>...<sup>5</sup>_. Before the equative, the locative-ablative, the ablative and the comitative case endings (and, in early sources, also before postpositions) the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular possessive suffix appears as *(s)n*<sup>319</sup> in and not *(s)n*<sup>5</sup>; e.g. in *täyirliär söz+in+lütü*<sup>5</sup>_<sup>5</sup>_<sup>5</sup> (Xuast 2) ‘with the word of the gods’.

In the dative form, the 3<sup>rd</sup> person possessive suffix also has the shape *(s)n*. In Orkhon Turkic we appear to get fusion of *(X)n*<sup>320</sup> and *(X)n*<sup>5</sup> with *+gA; as a result, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person possessive morphemes with dative ending give *(X)n*<sup>320</sup> and *(s)n*<sup>5</sup>A respectively. With nouns this *+gA is rare before Middle and Modern Turkic, as documented above. In Uyghur the 3<sup>rd</sup> person possessive appears as *(X)n*<sup>320</sup>A in the dative, e.g. *tutmisliärï* (MaitH XI 4v10) or *katiglannmakaï* (U IV A 265). After the Orkhon Turkic 1<sup>st</sup> person possessive suffix, the dative suffix is *(X)n*<sup>5</sup>+

319 I would not be so sure as the editor was that this is an error, but it does admittedly seem to be isolated.
320 öz+i+ka in line a 6 of the military ms. among the Thomsen-Stein documents is unclear; note also that the runiform characters for k and  are often quite similar.
321 In the Uyghur and Arabic scripts  is spelled as NK, in the Manichæan script as NG; in front-harmony words in these script one cannot therefore actually ‘see’ the fusion. It is however evident in the runiform and Indic scripts, which have special characters for this sound, as well as in back-harmony words in the Semitic scripts.
E7.4 probably shows the scribe first writing \( g^1 \)A and then ‘correcting’ to \( k^1 \)A.

The directive shows the same process, with \(+ (X) mArU\) in the 1\(^{st}\) person singular (e.g. runiform öv+i\(m\)är\(u\))^\text{322} \(+ (I) \eta ArU\) in the 2\(^{nd}\) and \(+ (s) \eta ArU\) (e.g. barmiš+i\(g\)aru in DreiPrinz 17) in the 3\(^{rd}\). We do have to remember that this is limited to an inner-morphological development and does not apply to regular juncture; there are many instances such as xagan+guru spelled as k\(^1\)g\(^n\)g\(^1\)r\(^1\)w in Tuñ 20, where /łu/ and /g/ do not fuse when they are adjacent to each other.

The linking of the possessive and accusative suffixes normally gives \(+ (X)mIn\), \(+ (X)\eta In\) and \(+ (s)\)In\) respectively in the 1\(^{st}\), 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) persons singular: \(+ (X)mIn\) appears in some Yenisey inscriptions and in Uygur, including such runiform mss. such as the IrqB; e.g. nom+um+\(m\) i\(ş\)id- ‘to listen to my teaching’ (MaitH XV 2v1), oţi\(g\)üm\(i\)n b\(ü\)t\(ü\)r- ‘to carry out my request’ (HTs V 311) or oţi\(g\)üm\(i\)n kö\(ş\)lä\(k\)lä\(m\) (TT X 462) ‘my mind and heart’; \(+ (X)\)\(η\)In e.g. in kul+\(u\)ğ+\(i\)n (Yos 10) ‘your slave (acc.)’ or \(ä\)t‘öţ\(ç\)i\(ş\)i\(n\) i\(ş\)alap (Suv 566,13) ‘sacrifice your body’. These forms predominate also in Manichæan sources, as listed in Zieme 1969: 106-107. In some early texts, however, the last syllable of the affix combinations had /\(X\)/ in the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) persons: kizk\(ā\)n\(c\)ü+\(η\)+\(i\)\(n\) (M III Nr.6 I r7) and kältöküm\(ü\)n kertgüng\(ü\)n (DreiPrinz 65) appear in very early texts and Gabain 1974: 98 mentions törö+\(η\)+\(i\)\(n\).

In the runiform inscriptions there is often no explicit vowel in the last syllable, so that ‘fourfold’ harmony is likely;\textsuperscript{323} In BQ N 11 we should presumably read bodun(u)m(u)n terü ... ‘organising my tribe’, in both ŠU E\textsuperscript{9}\textsuperscript{24} and Tariat W2 b(i)t(i)g(i)m(i)n b(ä)lgüm(u)n ... yassi\(ş\) ta\(ş\)ka yarad\(t\)ım / yarat\(t\)ıd\(m\) ‘I affixed my writing and my mark onto a flat stone’; cf. also töröm(u)\(n\) in Tariat W3 and suv(u)m(u)n in Tariat W4. Forms from unrounded stems as in ‘am\(t\) s\(ā\)n ... i\(ş\)i\(ţ\)i\(n\) i\(ş\)l\(i\)g\(i\)l\(ı\) tep tedi (Suv 600,22) ‘He said ‘Now carry out your job’ are not relevant for establishing the vowel of the accusative suffix since both /I/ and /\(X\)/ would give /I/ or /I/. In the Orkhon inscriptions there is a single instance of \(n^2\) after unrounded vowel in back-harmonic context, and in Sudži 1.6,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{322} The /\(I\)/ of the suffix is not explicit. Apparently because of this form and some others, Gabain 1974 §§187, 394 and 429 (as well as some other scholars) thought that Old Turkic had a case suffix of the shape ‘+ \(\eta\)U’; the matter is mentioned where I discuss the directive suffix in section 3.124.
\item \textsuperscript{323} The absence of an explicit vowel in one of the Semitic scripts (as often happens in Manichæan texts) cannot, however, be interpreted in any such direction.
\item \textsuperscript{324} In his transliteration / transcription Ramstedt writes b\(i\)lgü\(m\)\(i\)n, which means that there is an explicit I, but in his reproduction of the runiform text there is no such letter.
\end{itemize}
a relatively late runiform inscription from the period after the Uygur kaganate, wg \(1^{1/4}m^2\), presumably to be read as \(ogl+um+in\).\(^{325}\)

In the 3rd person accusative the suffix is practically never rounded; \(körkün\), used in this function in U 17.29 and 31 (KIP), might therefore be considered errors (\(körkın\) being used with this meaning even more often in the same passage).

The accusative of the plural possessive forms in the earliest Uygur texts has the same shape \(+Xn\) as in the singular, e.g. \(körk'ü+güzün\) ... \(yüz'ü\)güzün ‘your face’ in M I 10,7-9, \(isänjüz(j)n\) ‘your task’ 10,13, \(öz'ü\)güzün ‘your self’ 11,17, \(ängäk(ä)maž\)iň ‘our suffering’ 11,18, all in the same text, \(yerimüz(i)n\) ... \(üzümüzün\) üzüttümüzün ‘our place’, ‘our self and soul’ in M III Nr.1 IV r 9-11 or \(bägädmäkäjüz(j)n\) and \(ärlünkäköjüz(j)n\) in DreiPrinz 66-67 (which is also Manichaean). In Buddhist texts we get \(+nl\), as with the pronouns, already at a quite early stage, e.g. in the Sängim ms. of Mait and in TT VI. This does not exclude \(+Xn\) instances beside \(+nl\), as possibly in HTs III 454. Examples for this and for forms expanded with the plural suffix as \(ogulanı+gulın\) can be found in Doerfer 1993: 150.

Possessive suffix and comitative case appear in \(tä\)öz\(+\)in\(+\)lügün (Xw 2) ‘with the word of the gods’ and \(iki\) kutlug el[lig]\lär kamag toğlärin kunčuy[ar]iň tüzünlar\(+\)lugin (DreiPrinz 119) ‘the two blessed kings together with all their princes, wives and retinue’. This last example from a quite early text is remarkable: The three nouns share the case suffix as they would share a postposition. The comitative suffix can’t have come from a postposition (as has been suggested for some of the case suffixes) because it starts with an \(/l/\), which never appears at the beginning of words. It does suggest, however, that the case system originally was a two-tier one, as is proposed below in section 3.131 in connection with the oblique cases of the personal pronouns: The accusative of the possessive form appears originally to have been identical with the oblique base.

3.126. The converter \(+kl\)

The suffix \(+kl\) has an Orkhon Turkic variant \(+gl\) in \(tä\)harga\(+gö\) büglär in KT E7, BQ E7.\(^ {326}\) \(+kl\) itself happens in Orkhon Turkic to be attested

---

\(^{325}\) ‘\(yogu\) koragıdın’ ‘your funeral (acc.)’ in Ongin r4 (cf. T.Tekin 1968: 130 and Doerfer 1993: 149, where much of the documentation is brought together) is a misreading, as shown by the unpublished documentation of Thomsen and Wulff: There is no \(l\) at the end and the form is to be read as \(koragıdın\).

\(^{326}\) Tekin 1968’s reading ‘\(çöl+gi\)’ in Tuñ 23 (upheld in 2000: 84) is problematical for reasons given in EDPT 420.
only after vowels, with either the locative suffix (e.g. balikdaki ‘the one in the town’) or the directive -locative suffix +yA (e.g. ográk ‘the previous one’) or bärü ‘hither’.\textsuperscript{327}

In Uygur +kI converts adverbial phrases, mostly expressing place or time, into attributes; it thus functions like a relativising conjunction. In tägré yerintäki tokokunč kay ‘the ninth stratum in the land of the gods’ or tört yïjakdaki eliglär ‘the kings in the four regions of the earth’ (U II 23,20) it is added to noun phrases in the locative. However, we also find tört yïjakki burxan[lar] (Suv 25,9) ‘Buddhas in the four directions’ and kedin yïjakki sukavati atilg yertinčü (Suv 46,20) ‘the world called Sukhavati, which is in the east’ where the same phrase as in the previous example lacks the locative suffix. The reason for this double behaviour is that yïjak is both a noun and a postposition (see section 4.21). In kamagda üstünkä arxanlar (MaitH Y 502) ‘the highest arhats’ and soltünkä oğünk ‘which are on the left and/or on the right’ we find it with forms in the orientational formative +dXn. kïn tugusdünkä kapïg (MaitHami 15 1 a 2) ‘the eastern gate’ and kïn tugusdünkä yel (M III 19,12) ‘the eastern wind’ show phrases with this same formative, while in kuriyäki yïryäki oğräki bodun (Tuñ 17) ‘the western, northern and eastern nations’ the bases of +kI are variants of the directive-locative case suffix +rA. ot(ï)rakï ‘the one in the middle’ (Abhi A 109a9 and elsewhere) comes from orto ‘middle’ without a locative suffix. The absence of a local suffix or a postposition before +kI is characteristic of temporal expressions (see below); the late form ot(ï)ra (<< orto) may possibly have been felt to contain the suffix +rA. The ablative also appears as base, in kišilärdinki toz (HTs III 897) ‘the dust coming from the (arriving) persons’.

suv üzäki (MaitH XX 1r2) ‘(ships) which are on water’ and tašiin siyräki ... içün siyräki (MaitH XI 3r29-30) ‘external ... internal’ show the element added to postpositional phrases. There are a number of examples for ara+KI discussed in the UW entry for it; one instance with slightly aberrant meaning is tört yegirmi [kolü sanï] yalpükälar aräki yi[llar] ärtsär (MaitH XXV 4v4) ‘when 14 košs of years (in use) among humans pass’. All the mentioned phrases were local. šariputr birläki arxant toynlar (thus!; Saddh 36) ‘the arhat monks who (were) together with Šāriputra’, however, is not; further examples of birläki appear in Abhi. In the following highly involved instance, +kI is added

\textsuperscript{327} The reading of bï in anta bärükä ašok bašlg sogdak bodun (Tuñ 46) ‘the Sogdian population led by Ašok which is on the hither side (of those mentioned before)’ is not certain but is likely in view of the context. The context of bod(u)jìkì k(a)jì(a)nìgì in Taryat W5 is not clear.
to what is a static local expression in the context, although this does not follow from the morphology of the form kuvraglarka tâgikilâr: tâpîrîdâkî yerdâkî kök kalîk yûzîntâkilâr, ... beş yiîaşkêrîdâkî luo xanlarî, tâpîrlîg luoîg sâkîz bôîk kuvraglarka tâgikilâr ûêun (BT II 1354) '(We deflect our punya) for the benefit of those who are in the sky and on earth and on the face of heavens, for ..., for the dragon kings in the four directions, up to (i.e. including) the ones among the deities and dragons who are in the eight classes of crowds'. The locative of *kuvrag+lär+tä is deleted through the addition of the dative suffix (since there is no case recursivity with nouns) demanded by tâgi: The locative must be understood as if it were there, as this is one element (which happens to be the last one) in a list of types of creatures located in various places.

In general, it is the +dA form without +kI which appears in existential expressions with bar; in the following instance, however, we find +dA+kI: yerînêcûdâkî nêcêî ulûg yaqêî kûnlâr bar, nêyî bo yaqêî kûn bîrla az uûîsêcêkîyê f (ms. T III MQ 62 = U 5088 quoted in the note to BT V 438) ‘Whatever there are of great New Days in this world, by no means do they [have] even the slightest part [in common] with this New Day’. Added to temporal expressions we have e.g. başînêî ‘the one in the beginning’ (BT II 57), kenêî ‘the later one’ (BT II 117), kişêî ‘winterly’, ayêî ‘monthly (i.e. applying to a month; examples in the UW entry), bir kûnki ‘pertaining to one day’ (Mait 73v27). In öyîrânîn bûrûkî ‘the one which exists since an earlier time’ (BT II 178) and ilkîsîzîn bûrûkî ‘which exist from the beginning of all time (lit. from when there was nothing previous)’ the suffix is added to a temporal postpositional phrase. bo kûntâ öyîrêkî ... berîm ‘debts from before this day’ (Mi5,5 in SammUigKontr 2) also has a noun phrase as base. In ârtmîş üdîkî ‘the past one (lit. the one pertaining to past time)’ and ken kûllîmê üdîkî ‘the future one (lit. the one pertaining to time to come later)’ (B T II 72 and 141 respectively) the suffix is added to heads with attributive participles. sökî (cf. adverbial sö+n) oza+ki and aþnu+kî all signify ‘previous’, the third e.g. in aþnu+kî tabgaç+da+kî oguz tûrîk (ŠU S9) ‘the Oguz (and??) Turks who were previously in China’,328 kîsêî, ayêî, kûnki etc. are presumably possible only because nouns denoting stretches of time can be used adverbially also in the nominative.

---

328 Examples for aþnu+ki can be found in the entry of the UW, which also gives a few examples for adnominal aþnu. I have here translated adnominal aþnu+ki with the adverb ‘previously’, because the Turkic construction has no verb whereas the synonymous English one does.
In Abhi there are a number of examples in which +kl is added to a clause in ärkän: tugum košulu turur ärkänki üdtä (270) or bodisatv ärkänki üdtä (2158) ‘at a time when (Buddha) was (still) a bodhisattva’. The form tāg-māz+kān+ki is especially common, e.g. in Abhi B 1620: sorińčän taš nāčá usar ymā kapgalī tāgmāźkānī tāmūrīg ‘as a magnetic stone is able to catch a (piece of) iron which it was not in contact with’. This text being so creative about +kl we also find uzät+ki ‘what has existed for a long time’ in Abhi A 1051, coming from a petrified converb.

In yaśuraktī išī uzā kapigīg īğırsār (TT I 217) ‘if somebody bores a hole in your door because of a secret matter’, the base is a converb which is neither local nor temporal, if interpreted correctly. The DLT has yaśru iš, so that we know that, at least in Qarakhanid, yaśru could also be used adnominally without +kl. The need for +kl may, in this case, have been the bracketing: It might have been needed to show that yaśru was not qualifying the verb or the whole rest of the clause but just iš.

+kl forms can lose their head, i.e. get recycled: They can then be pluralised, as in taśtin siğardünkīlār (HTs VIII 189) ‘those who are on the outside’ or トル+ta+ki+lar ‘the ones in the realm’; above we quoted another such instance from BT II 1354.

Headless +kl forms also get case suffixes, e.g. トル+tīn+ki+g ‘the easternly one (acc.)’ (Maue 1996 Nr.21/34), kalīk+ta+ki+nī (U II 69,4, with the late or pronominal accusative suffix), kamag yer üzā+ki+nīg kūtī kīvī (Xw 77-8) ‘the blessing of everything on earth’; tōrī bitığ+dā+ki+čā (Suv 547,48) ‘as in the book on ethics’, bōkākčā uzun (BT V 148) ‘long as on this day’ or tīrgdākčā (KT SE) ‘as when one is alive’. odug+um+da+ki+dā yeğrāk (Suv 125,13) is ‘better than in my waking state’: The first +da is local while the second is governed by yeğrāk ‘better’.

With both plural and case suffix: avdākär’tin enčik āsānkī avıtı idur biz (UigBrief C3) ‘We are sending (this), inquiring (whether) those at home are well and happy’; öğrākärnīngdé ‘than that of the previous ones’ is in HTs VII 199-200 opposed to antīkāranīngda ‘than that of the present ones’.

+kl forms can be governed by postpositions, e.g. yugant üdtāki tāg (MaitH XX 1r12) ‘as in the yugānta age’. öğrākī tāg is in BT XIII 8,10-12 mistakenly translated as ‘wie das Vorige’; in fact it signifies ‘as before’: Unlike German, English, French or Spanish, Old Turkic postpositions are unable to govern adverbs and therefore need them nominalised; cf. Turkish önceki gibi ‘as before’.
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In BT III 543-545 the possessive suffix (in the accusative case) appears after +kl: “bar ârsâr mâniç âzkyâ ârsâr ymâ mâniûm kadağim, ... erînilâr mâniûnlâr” tep, “âtôz+dâ+ki+m+în ârsâr ymâ, tîl+tâ+ki+m+în ârsâr ymâ, köñüle+dâ+ki+m+în ârsâr ymâ” ‘He said “If I have even a bit of sins, ... criticise and chastise them, be they my sins of body, of tongue or of heart.” köñüle+dâ+ki+m+în means ‘the ones I have which are in the heart’; köñüle+tüm+dâ+ki+ni would have signified ‘the ones which are in the my heart’.

içräki ‘inner’, which is in form similar to öyräki, tägrâki (e.g. U II 22 v 2) and asräki, is found in adnominal use among other places in KT S2 = BK N2, BK N14, M I 17,8 and Xw. içräki ‘the internal one’ got lexicalised and was used as a title in a number of early Turkic languages, also in Eastern Europe. içräki+kâ (ThS I a 21) is an example for this title in nominal use. The earliest examples appear in the Yenisey inscriptions E4, E11,1 and, spelled with G, E37,1.

ilki ‘first’ is also formed with +kl. It is related to the directive form ilgârû ‘forward; eastwards’, but their base no longer seems to have been alive in Old Turkic. ilkidâ signifies ‘before’ as well as ‘at first’ (e.g. in MaitH XX 14v13 and XXV 3v25), showing the meaning which il+ki must have had originally. Cf. also ilkidâki in MaitH XX Endblatt r2, with recursive +kl. Starting with the DLT (though not in all modern Turkic languages) ilki was metanalysed into ilk+ 3rd person possessive suffix.

It happens that +kl phrases are adverbial, e.g. ol künkî biziç ašda ölärğûçî ud koyn toguç bašlâp fûnlîglar (Suv 6,13) ‘creatures, mainly bovines, sheep and pork, which we slaughtered on that day at our meal’. The phenomenon should be recognized before the +kl is emended away, as done by Röhrborn for ürdâbârûki tarîmîš tikmiš yeg tiltaglar (HTs VII 184), although this signifies ‘the good causes planted at an early stage’: This is clearly an attraction, but it may have some linguistic reality behind it.

3.13. Pronouns

These differ from other nominals in allowing double case suffixation with the demonstrative and interrogative pronouns and in generally having only two of the four (or five, if one includes (in)definiteness)

---

329 Turkish uses it without the final vowel; this misled the EDPT into positing a base ilk for Old Turkic.
330 Note that a case sequence +nXy+dA is possible also with nouns. +ẽU/îyU, which – rarely – gets added to nouns as well, probably consists of +ẽA and +îyU.
nominal categories, number and case. Possessive suffixes, representing a third category, were in use only with the interrogative kayu ‘which’ with the meaning ‘which of them’, and we have found two correlative instances of kim+i ‘who among them’; the near-pronominal noun öz is regularly found with possessive suffixes. Some pronouns differ from nouns and adjectives also in showing vowel alternations (described below) and in having the pronominal +n\(^{331}\). 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) person personal pronouns differ in having a plural suffix +(X)z instead of +lAr, found also in the possessive suffixes of these persons (though +lAr can additionally be appended to the 2\(^{nd}\) person plural pronoun).

Old Turkic has personal pronouns of the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) persons, bân and sân, at least two demonstrative pronouns bo ‘this’ and ol ‘that’, a reflexive pronoun käntü and three interrogative-indefinite pronouns, käm ‘who’ (nominative in the runiform inscriptions and mss., e.g. Blatt 27; kim elsewhere), nä ‘what’ and *ka ‘which’. A few additional stems are also discussed in the next sections. All pronouns show the category of number and, recursively, the category of case; oblique demonstrative forms can be converted to attributive use by the element +kI.

bir ikintiš kä ‘each other, one another’ is also, in fact, a pronoun, as it stands for noun phrases: It represents the participant group connected with cooperative-reciprocal verbs as the reflexive pronoun stands for reflexive verbs. Although this element looks as if it contains the dative suffix, it is in fact used also if two parties are each other’s direct objects. bir ikintikä (e.g. DKPAM 527), showing the simple dative of the ordinal of ‘two’ is a rare alternant of this: It may possibly have been its source; cf. also bir ikinti birlä (Wettkampf 41-43).

The declension of pronouns differs to a smaller or greater extent from that of nouns. One feature which characterises the declension of all pronouns (though not of öz, which is a noun in other senses as well) and distinguishes them from nouns and adjectives is the accusative ending +nI. From the earliest texts, this ending is found also with a number of quantifiers of miscellaneous origin and collectives ending in +(A)gU, in accordance with their pro-nominal use. alku ‘all’, e.g., gets the +nI allomorph of the accusative suffix in TT II.1 16 and in a number of other examples mentioned in UW 101; cf. kamïgu+nï ‘all (acc.)’ (Pothi

---

\(^{331}\) The stems of demonstrative pronouns and the 3\(^{rd}\) person possessive suffix end in the consonant /n/, deleted in the nominative. The /n/ appears also when the 3\(^{rd}\) person possessive suffix is followed by the antonymy and parallelism suffix +lI. With the personal pronouns an /n/ element appears in all the forms except in the nominative plural. In Orkhon Turkic the stem of the collective suffix +(A)gU is also expanded with an /n/ when possessive suffixes follow (cf. OTWF 97).
61), *ikigü-ni* ‘both (acc.)’ (HTs IV 748, BT I A 2 33), *adinagu-ni* ‘other people’ (U III 4,3 1) and *yumkï-ni* ‘all of them (acc.)’ (Pothi 101). In the course of the development of Old Turkic (cf. Erdal 1979) and towards modern Turkic languages, +ni then gradually gets applied to noun stems as well, in late Old Turkic mainly to stems ending in vowels and to foreign words.

3.131 Personal pronouns

The personal pronouns for speaker and addressee are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>1st pers. sg.</th>
<th>1st pers. pl.</th>
<th>2nd pers. sg.</th>
<th>2nd pers. pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>bän / män</td>
<td>biz (bizlär)</td>
<td>sän</td>
<td>siz, sizlär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>bäṅni̇, mäṅni̇, mini̇</td>
<td>biżi̇, biżni̇</td>
<td>säṅi̇</td>
<td>sīzi̇, sīzi̇ni̇, sīzläni̇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>baña / maña</td>
<td>biżi̇n̄, biżkä</td>
<td>sāqa</td>
<td>sīzi̇n̄, sīzlän̄n̄, sīzlänr̄n̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>bini / mini</td>
<td>bizni</td>
<td>sīni</td>
<td>sīzni, sīzlän̄i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>minitä, mīndä, bizintä/biznitä</td>
<td>sintä, sindä, sīzi̇ntä/sīzni̇dä,</td>
<td>sīn̄dä</td>
<td>sīzländä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>mintin, mīn̄din</td>
<td>biznidin</td>
<td>sīn̄din</td>
<td>sīzni̇din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simil.</td>
<td>bağju̇ru / mağru̇</td>
<td>biżi̇ni̇r̄u</td>
<td>sāguru</td>
<td>sīzi̇ḡuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biżi̇ni̇l̄l̄ẏü</td>
<td>sīni̇l̄l̄l̄y′ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We here find a consistent alternation between high and low vowels, which we also have with the demonstrative pronouns and possibly with *käm* ‘who’: low front vowels in the nominative332 and the genitive singular, low back vowels in the dative and the directive singular, high front vowels everywhere else. *mīntä* in a letter in HamTouHou 25,2 is aberrant.333 I have no doubt that the vowel in *bini*, *minitä* etc., *sini*, *sintä* etc. is (pre)historically the same as that found in *biz* and *siz*. *bini* and *sini*, both spelled with twice I, are attested already in Tuñ 10. I have come across *mini̇* only in ms. M 657 v3 (quoted in the note to BT V 521) and KP 80,2 and *mini̇* in HamTouHou 18 (a letter sent from Khotan) 1,2; in KP 6,4 *mini* is spelled as MNY, but the same text has

---

332 Note, though, that the nominative singular personal pronouns are usually spelled without any vowel, as *mn* and *sn* respectively.

333 It would have fitted well with the theory of Doerfer 1993: 26, who reads the accusative form as *meni* and not *mini*. He says that the fronting is the result of backward raising of the vowels by assimilation (see that in section 21401) and would presumably take *minitä* to have followed by analogy. However, such raising comes up only after the inscriptions.
MYNY in four other instances. Further we find barmagay sîn (KP 19,3) ‘You will not go’ and igdâyî ‘tâprüî mîn nomêî mîn’ tegmâkä artîçip ... “getting foiled by one who falsely says “I am a man of God and a preacher”” in the ms. written in Manichean script of Xw 121; the latter pronouns clearly seem to be intended to be understood as clitic, as they are written close to the words they follow. Their shapes are similar to Turkish sÎn ‘you’ and Khakas BÎn ‘I’, which are both used clitically, follow synharmonism and show high vowels. The nominative of this pronoun is, in fact, normally written without any vowel in Uygur script, which makes it impossible to say how it was pronounced in the texts written in that script. Possibly, this defective spelling reflects just the variability posited here, though one instance for it is a rather narrow base for such an hypothesis. See also n.737 in Zieme 1969, where scholarly sources are quoted for mîn in Middle and Modern Turkic languages. These few variants with i could be the result of analogy from those forms of this pronoun which do have it: This is what happened in those modern Turkic languages where nominative demonstrative bo was replaced by bu. In Brâhî texts we have, e.g. kêlmas sîn (TT VIII D32) or barmagay sizlär (TT VIII E49), which show that these pronouns did not follow synharmonism. According to Alyılmaz 2000: 111, who inspected the stone of Tuñ in 1997, 1998 and 1999, Tuñ 57 does not have ‘bîntägi’ but bîntägi bar ârsär ‘(if a sovereign nation anywhere) had someone like me, (what trouble could it encounter?)’ with explicit I in the first syllable.  

334 mîn+îg in BT I D78 is not the accusative of the pronoun but of a noun denoting the self, i.e. ‘the ego’.

335 In the other ms., written in Uygur writing, both instances are spelled in the normal form, as mn, without any explicit vowel. Hamilton transcribes the pronoun in KP 19,3 as ‘sen’ but there is no justification for a change sîn > ‘sen’: mîn and sîn could come from analogy with the accusative, locative, ablative and simulative forms.

336 The note a reader who says he came from China added with a brush to the Manichean ms. edited in M I 23-29 has the phrase yazukaz kâtîrînî ‘I am overcoming sin’ and even mîn ‘I’ starting a sentence. These instances cannot be taken as evidence for Manichean Uygur as the person also has an imperative with s instead of z, y(a)rl(î)k(â)sîmlar (and uses the ablative with +în and not +în). What is noteworthy concerning the two instances in the Xw ms. and k(â)tîrînî is that in all three cases the syllable preceding the pronoun with a high vowel shows /Ô/: This consonant may be responsible for the high vowels, as well as for the irregular vowel of the aorist suffix, which should be -âr.

337 Tekin 1968 translated ‘bîntägi’ as “such a man”, assuming backward fronting assimilation, but such assimilation is nowhere attested either with tâg or in any other way; in antâg < an+ tâg and montâg < mon+ tâg there is forward assimilation, the normal process for Turkic. Aalto writes “Taugenichte (?)”, which does not fit any known Old Turkic lexeme.
referring to a nation), is similar to montag ‘like this’, antag ‘like that’ and sizintäg ‘like you’ (ChristManMsFr ManFr r10) in being constructed on the oblique base; had the base been the (syncopated) accusative form, the latter would have had to be ‘siznitàg’ (since the accusative of siz is sizni though the locative is sizintä and the dative sizintä). Had montag (of which we have at least 11 Brahmī examples) been derived from the accusative munï, its vowel would have been /u/ and not /o/.

The change to back vowels in the singular dative and the directive, not found in any other paradigm, may be secondarily due to the influence of the velar element in the case suffixes; the idea of Doerfer 1977 that these forms came from the agglutination of a dative element qa seems groundless. The only place where the dative of sän is found in the runiform inscriptions is in Tuñ 32, and it is there spelled with s².338 bâya and bâyaru (both Tuñ) are both written with b¹.339 süyâ and sâya would be indistinguishable in the Semitic scripts used by the Uygurs. The only instance of the dative of sän in an Uygur text written in an Indic writing system is in Maue 1996 20 Nr.22, a source centuries later than the Orkhon inscriptions; there the word is spelled as saya. Directive forms of sän and bän appear not to be attested in Indic writing systems. Although the Tuñ instance is isolated, one could have taken it as good evidence since the text may be the oldest extant Turkic source we have. However, we find that this same inscription occasionally uses s² also in words absolutely known to belong to back harmony such as bolsar, savïn, savïg and sakïntïm, the other consonants in these words being spelled with the back harmony letters. The s² of the dative of the 2nd person singular pronoun in this inscription is there of no significance in view of the absence of other evidence for a front pronunciation.

The QB has six examples of a dative form saṣar ‘to you’ beside saṣa, which presumably resulted from analogy with the demonstrative

338 The other letters in the word, ŋ and A, do not distinguish between back and front harmony in the runiform inscriptions from Mongolia.

339 Gabain 1974: 91 refers to a place in Radloff’s edition of the Yenisey inscriptions for a putative instance of bâga. This is E9.3, for which Orkun instead (referring to the Finnish Atlas) proposes the reading bângas yok ârmis; he is followed by Vasiliev in his atlas. Kurt Vulf’s unpublished materials have bângis yok ârmis. The inscription is dealt with by Kormusin 1997. mAgA of the other runiform inscriptions gives no information on this matter, as the character inventory for those inscriptions has the same character for m and ŋ in back and front contexts; maṣaru in HanTouHou 26.10 in Uygur writing could have been read with front vowels as well (as in fact done by the editor). Cf. further maṣaru in māṣarī ḍālp in VimalaZieme 494.
pronouns (which serve for the 3rd person); the recourse to five of these appears to have been metre or rhyme related.

A characteristic of the personal pronouns is the plural morpheme +\((X)\)z (found also in the possessive suffixes), but +lAr is also already present in all varieties of Uygur. There are a number of instances of sizlär beside siz but hardly any bizlär beside biz; the former form is found e.g. in U I 6,2 (Magier; bulsar sizlär) and 43,7, TT II,1 77 (önläsär sizlär) or MaitH XI 3r2. In oblique cases we have e.g. sizlärni birlä (U IV A 81), sizlärđä in ablative meaning in early sizlärđä almïš agu (M I 19,15) ‘the poison taken from you (pl.’; sizlärn(i)ŋ in Yos 11. I have met bizlär only in Mi13,1 (SammlUigKontr 2), a collective receipt, and in a late Uygur inscription (PetInscr). The reason for the difference between the 1st and 2nd persons is that siz is mostly used for the polite singular, sizlär becoming necessary for referring to the 2nd person plural (polite or not).

The genitive of biz appears both as bizŋ and as biznŋ: Orkhon Turkic, Manichean texts, sources in Sogdian script (which have some pre-classical characteristics) all have bizŋ, as do Buddhist texts in general (e.g. in BT XIII 12E r4, TT IV A 24 and B 37 and 41); biznŋ crops up here and there, however, mostly in late sources (e.g. TT VII) but also in Manichean and early Xw 8 (one among three mss.; the other two missing). siznŋ is even rarer than biznŋ. The Suv has 13 examples of bizŋ and 34 of sizŋ as against only one each of biznŋ and siznŋ; sizŋ also appears e.g. in DreiPrinz 66, TT II,1 17, 19, 23 and 49 or Pothi 95. The ‘pronominal n’ was clearly originally not part of these genitives; the longer forms must be related to the replacement of +\((n)X$$ \eta $$ by +nX$$ \eta $$ as genitive suffix.

Above we discussed the form siz+lär. In very late texts that can be replaced by sänlär, and we have silär and silärnŋ in HamTouHou 21,4 and silärn in KP 76,3 and 5. silär probably does not result from a phonetic dropping of /l/ but from the replacement of the pronominal plural marker +iXz by the much more ‘regular’ +lAr.

bän, bini ‘I; me’ and biz ‘we’ share their b° with bo, the demonstrative of close deixis (presumably pointing at the domain of the speaker) and bärü ‘hither; since’, which signals movement towards the ‘here and now’ of the speaker. The ‘n would then be the ‘pronominal +n’ absent in biz and siz, normally characteristic of oblique cases; I take it to have

\[\text{What is read as sizn(ä)ŋ in M I 10,11 and crops up as sizn(i)ŋ in Gabain 1974: 92 can just as well be read as sizŋ, with the vowel lowering occasionally found in pre-classical sources.}\]
been introduced into bän by analogy.\textsuperscript{341} This element does, however, reappear in the oblique forms of the plural personal pronouns, unlike the plural demonstratives.\textsuperscript{342}

The ablative, the locative-ablative and the similative are partly constructed on an intercalatory element +ni+ identical with the pronominal accusative ending; thus e.g. sinidî U III 48,11, minidâ Ad2,11 (SammlUigKontr 2), sinidâ TT I 126 or U III 83,3, biznidâ Suv 433,22 and 611,1 or U IV A 267. This element appears also before the suffixes +lxg and +sxz, which we have assigned to word formation: We have biznîlîr tûn(tî)glar (UigOn III B r3) ‘us poor creatures’ and, with the demonstrative to be dealt with straightway, munîsîz (ETŞ 12,47) ‘without this’.\textsuperscript{343} However, I assume mintin in mintin âdrlî- in DKPAMPb 866, coming from the oblique base and not the accusative, to be the original form.\textsuperscript{344}

The directive, dative and partly the locative-ablative and the similative of plural personal pronouns have +in+ instead; e.g. siznâ in M III Nr.6 I r 3, or TT II,1 73, biz(zî)ndâ in Xw 166 (all three mss.), siznârâ twice in the fragment quoted in the note to BT V 175 and six times in M III Nr.9. +in+ turns up also in the postpositional phrase siznât ‘like you’ (ChrManMsFr Man Fr r 10). We have biznîtâ in M I 33,20 and siznîtâ in M I 10,5; biznidâ is quoted above and siznidâ is the general form. One could, with Doerfer 1992 (and with Nauta 1969 quoted by him) speak of this ‘nî’ element as forming an oblique stem (in the manner of Tokharian or Romani, which have two-tier case systems). However, an alternation between +n, +xn and +ni is found also in the accusative ending of the nominal possessive forms (discussed at the end of section 3.124); there it appears after the possessive suffix and can

\textsuperscript{341} The Proto-Turkic nominatives of ‘I’ and ‘you’ might have been *bâ and *sî; the vowel of Bolgar-Chuvash *bi and *sî apparently comes from a different analogy with the oblique stems.

\textsuperscript{342} The dative has been read as bizkâ just once, in Yenisey E36,2; however, according to Kurt Wulff’s unpublished manuscript the stone shows b’lz’l (perhaps biz åki ‘we two’). This inscription is not among those dealt with by Kormušin 1997.

The form s(i)zû mentioned as dative in Gabain 1974: 92 and said to appear in Yenisey inscriptions is to be read as âsîz-du ‘oh, alas!’, as pointed out by T. Tekin 1964. (The interjection (y)a, dealt with in section 3.4 below, appears to have followed vowel harmony in Yenisey Turkic though not in Uygur.) Besides, the Old Turkic dative suffix is not +a but +ka. Nor does a form stzdû, equally mentioned by Gabain on this page with the mark ‘(Yen)’, appear in the indices of Orkun 1936–41 or Kormušin 1997 or in the DTS.

\textsuperscript{343} Cf. also mûnsîc in BT VIII B 124 and 151 and several times in BT I.

\textsuperscript{344} Sintû in Suvi 680,11 is from Buyan Ävirmâk, a passage added to the text at a much later stage.
hardly have anything to do with an ‘oblique stem’. The regular dative of *biz* is *bizi*; in two economical texts (WP1,8 and Mi30,2 in SammlUigKontr 2) we find *bizkä* (both very clear on the faces.

In Qarakhanid Turkic, postpositions which govern the nominative of nouns govern either the accusative of pronouns (as happens in other corpuses of Old Turkic) or their genitive (as e.g. in Turkish). We also find there that there is *säni* beside *sinidä*, *säni* beside *sinidin*, and even *säni* beside *sinidin*, *anïnda*, *anïdin* and *anïsiz*; *bizi* beside *bizdä*; *munïndä* and *munïndin* and so forth. The genitive as base for secondary cases comes into extensive use only in Qarakhanid and is by Ata 2002: 67 documented from Middle Turkic; it does however exist in late Uygur as well: There is *bizi* *ulat* in Abhi 1224, *bizi* *ak* in Abhi 2297 and *bizi* *el* several times in the Petersburg ms. of the Suv. Cf. the hapax *anï* *ken* ‘thereafter’ in Suv 26,18.345 There is no need for accusative or genitive content here (unlike case doubling among the demonstrative and interrogative pronouns). It therefore really looks as if the base of concrete cases is identical with the base for postpositions; whether this is a secondary phenomenon which came about through analogy or whether it comes from the time when some of these case endings were postpositions is hard to decide.

Additional locative forms are *sintädä* e.g. in *sintädä* *adin* ‘different from you’ (U IV C87) and *sintädä* *ögni* (TT X 466), *sintidä* in *sintidä* *ögrä* ‘before you’ (Suv 626,5); the element +dX+ presumably comes from a reduction of +dA but I have no convincing explanation for why the locative-ablative suffix should appear doubly. *mintidä* has been read in U IV D86 and translated ‘von mir’. However, this form looks identical and needs to be distinguished from *mintida* / *mintida* / *mintada*, which is a variant of *muntada*, from *bo* (discussed in section 3.132). The translation ‘(from) here’ cannot be quite excluded for U IV D86; in Mait 187r11-12, however, the meaning seems to be rather certain: *kop kamag tïnlïglarag ... tuta tägintim. ançulayu ymä sän mintidä kamag tïnlïglarag urunçak tugil* ‘Here, similarly, please accept from me all the creatures in trust’.

*mintirdin* ‘from me’ (BT VIII B 49) and *sindirtin* (Suv 428,11) in *sindirtin bo nom ardinek așîjaialar* ‘those who hear this jewel of a *sûra* from you’ are built on an element +dXr+ best attested with the demonstrative pronouns.

*bizi* *el* in Suv 425,15, 431,14 and 434,4 is clearly a late form, reflecting the Middle Turkic replacement of the accusative form by the
genitive before postpositions; the parallel Berlin fragment U 580 v16 (which is centuries older than the Petersburg ms.) instead of the instance in 425,15 writes bizinčulâyû, which is what we expect. Instead of sizničulâyû in Suv 497,13, the Berlin ms. U 752 r3 has siniculâyû (with +čU+), which must be the original form. All the simulative forms mentioned above presumably come from +čA+IAYU: we find the similarly formed ancîlayu and munîlayu among the demonstrative pronouns, but there we also have anîlayu and munîlayu based on the accusatives. Ottoman has bencîleyin 'like me' and buncîlayayin 'like this' and the Kaça dialect of Hakes has +čZil < +čZîlayû etc. added to nouns. It is unclear whether +čU+ can be connected with +čA; an 'alternation' A / U would not make sense in the Old Turkic phonological context.

bolar ikigû mâniﬂär ol (U III 27,16) signifies 'these two are both mine'; it shows that the plural suffix can follow the genitive form of a personal pronoun for the sake of agreement with the topic.

No instrumental or equative forms of the personal pronouns appear to have turned up in Old Turkic; sânin and mâncâ are, however, attested in Middle Turkic (Ata 2002: 67).

bän, bini, bânîq, baya and bajarû are attested only in a part of the runiform inscriptions, all other Old Turkic sources showing m. The Tuñokok inscription shows mân instead of bän as subject pronoun following upon verb forms; e.g. h(â)n (a)nçâ t(â)r mâ(n) (37) 'As for me, I say the following'. It has 17 instances of bän and 5 instances of mân (all after te-r) used in this way. This is the only certain difference in Old Turkic between personal pronouns in independent and postverbal use; this does not yet foreshadow the personal pronouns' subsequent reduction to suffix status in the latter position. The doubtlessly later Tariat inscription, on the other hand, still writes köçär bän (W4). Doerfer 1994: 111 has dealt with the inscriptions evidence for this matter.

This postverbal use of pronouns appears to be obligatory with verb forms not having morphological person, as the aorist or the future forms. We sometimes find such pronouns also with verb forms with morphological person expression, as biz in the following: kîçûmûz bir ikinti birîlî sînalinîm biz 'Let us compete with each other in strength' (Wettkampf 41-43).
3.132 Demonstratives

Old Turkic has two active demonstrative pronouns and paradigm fragments of a third one (mentioned below); their forms are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>bo</td>
<td>munoğ/monuğ</td>
<td>munbîr/muşa</td>
<td>bunî/munî</td>
<td>bunta/munta</td>
<td>muntîn</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>bunça/munça</td>
<td>(bürü)</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>bolar</td>
<td>bolarnığ</td>
<td>bolarka (QB)</td>
<td>bolarnî</td>
<td>bolarta</td>
<td>bolardîn (QB)</td>
<td>munar</td>
<td>anîn</td>
<td>anî+cça</td>
<td>anîlayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>anîñ</td>
<td>âgar / âşça</td>
<td>anî</td>
<td>anta</td>
<td>antîn</td>
<td>anîn</td>
<td>anî+cça</td>
<td>âşgaru</td>
<td>anîlayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>olar</td>
<td>olarnî</td>
<td>olarka</td>
<td>olarni</td>
<td>olarta</td>
<td>olardîn (QB)</td>
<td>olarÎ(a)</td>
<td>olâ+rÎ ^a+</td>
<td>olâ+rÎ</td>
<td>olâ+rÎ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>bolar / bolar</td>
<td>bolarnî</td>
<td>bolarka (QB)</td>
<td>bolarnî</td>
<td>bolarta</td>
<td>bolardîn (QB)</td>
<td>munar</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>bolar / bolar</td>
<td>bolarnî</td>
<td>bolarka (QB)</td>
<td>bolarnî</td>
<td>bolarta</td>
<td>bolardîn (QB)</td>
<td>munar</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
<td>munîlayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
<td>munun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equ.</td>
<td>bunça / munça</td>
<td>bunça / munça</td>
<td>bunça / munça</td>
<td>bunça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
<td>munça / munça</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The singular oblique pronouns have the so-called pronominal /n/ before the suffix. There are, then, oblique stems bun+ and a'n+ differing from the nominative stems bo and ol; bo and bun+ also differ in the vowel, alternating like the personal pronoun. The possessive suffixes of the 3rd person show the oblique pronominal /n/ as the demonstratives do. In Uygur, the b becomes m when a nasal follows; this replacement did not yet take place in the inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire, as shown e.g. in bunda in Tariat W 2. The /rl/ in the

---

346 A demonstrative šo "dieser dort," which is by Gabain 1974: 94 (page top) said to turn up as šinda in the Yenisey inscriptions, does not exist. The author found this in Radloff’s ‘Glossar zu den Inschriften am Jenissei’ (Radloff 1987: 373 -4), which refers to E28 VII and E38 I. The first is to be read as altun soğa yiş käyiki ‘the game of the Altun Soğa (or Soğa) mountain forest’, the second as altu’un soğa kälip ‘coming to Altun Soğ’a’ (no doubt the same place as the one mentioned in E28). Radloff did not distinguish between the round ŋ and the diamond shaped ő’d. Turkish şu comes from the presentative şı coupled with the pronoun o; Ottoman also has şol < a şol.

347 Forms generated by double case marking are mentioned further on. The Uygur singular oblique forms of ol are extensively documented in the UW; no instances will therefore be mentioned here.

348 Munkácsi 1919: 125 has pointed out that the Uralic languages also have a pronominal +n which appears only with the singular forms. Cf. the +n which is added to Mongolic nouns in the singular but is replaced by +t in the plural.

349 The Yakut suffix vowel alternation bâs+a ‘his head, nominative’, bûs+în accusative perhaps preserves an original alternation as found in the Old Turkic pronouns between bo (low vowel) and bu+ (high vowel).
The directive singular, which reminds one of the directive, is limited to the demonstratives: The runiform inscriptions have ajar, not aja; ajar is also the general form in Manichaean texts, e.g. in DreiPrinz 27. In Buddhist texts there is a fluctuation between the two forms; cf. UW 162a. majar is attested in M I 23,8, also in HTs and DLT. The forms ajar and majar are older than the forms without /t/; the latter were no doubt created in analogy to the personal pronouns (especially since the demonstratives were used for the 3rd person). The variants maja and aja occur in late Uyghur texts (e.g. maja in BTT I A₂ 24, aja in Pothi 162, which is Manichaean but late). majar and ajar are still to be found in Muslim Middle Turkic texts (Ata 2002: 62); when QB 3475 writes maja, that is for the sake of rhyme with maja. The /t/ is attested also in the Codex Comanicus and lives on in Tatar and also appears in the dative of the Yakut possessive suffixes.

The directive ajaru is attested once in the Tu ajaru ajaru inscription (l.20) but is absent from Qarakhanid and very rare in Uyghur; the UW entry mentions only two instances and the reading of one of these is said to be uncertain. Forms like ingaru, which comes from an alternative but obsolete pronominal stem, are discussed below.

The instrumental of bo is munun in M III Nr. 30 r 5 but munin in the QB. munun signifies ‘herewith’ whereas anin means ‘therefore’.

The only case form which appears not to be attested in the singular is the directive of bo. This may not be a coincidence: bärü ‘hither’ may be the half-suppletive missing directive. This word has a long vowel in Turkmen (though not in Khaladj), which would speak for a contraction of the stem with the directive suffix. Examples such as bärü eš idi ëñ*ó ô braxmayu for this interpretation of bärü.

The similative is the only case to be regularly based on munin and anin, the forms identical with the accusative but also found with

---

350 It would not be correct to call ajar “ein alter Dir(ektiv)”, as done in UW 162a, as the directive suffix never drops its final vowel. Even if there really is only a single Old Turkic instance of ajaru attested (as stated in the entry for this form in the 1981 fascicle of the UW) the Tuñ inscription has both ajar and ajaru.

351 In the UW entry for aja (which also documents ajar) we read: “ajar ist auch in späten Texten (z.B. BT III) belegt und taugt nicht zur Charakterisierung eines Textes als früh oder relativ früh (gegen M. Erdal: Voice and case in Old Turkish. Diss. phil. Jerusalem 1976. Bd.1. 17m.). Man vergleiche auch die Verwendung von aja und ajar im gleichen Kont. in Suv ...”; While ajar indeed does not characterise a text as (relatively) early, the presence of aja does appear to characterise it as rather late.

352 The idea that bärü could have come from a contraction with the directive suffix +gArU was already expressed by W. Bang 1919 ff.
postpositions and, in the form munîsîz (ETS 12,47), before the privative formative. Besides, anêça has a rare variant anî+êça (cf. UW). The personal pronoun also appears in the accusative form when serving as base to another common formative, in biznîlig (quoted above). Concerning the simulative, the use of an accusative as stem might be related to the fact that +îAyU comes from a formative, +îA-, which forms denominal verbs.

montag ‘like this’ and antag ‘like that’ (in the UW documented on five pages) can both also be translated as ‘such’. Their source is the demonstrative oblique stem with the postposition tâg ‘like’, here assimilated by synharmonism. Both by stem form and harmony, these are in fact case forms. montag and antag are used nominally and adnominally, whereas simulative munîlayu ‘thus’ and anîlayu (always with ok, signifying ‘in that same way’) are in adverbial use.

antag antag ‘such and such’ serves for alluding to the content of verbal messages, e.g. in Suv 603,11 and twice in Suv 14,11-12: ärklig xan anî açîp okîdetka anta antag antag sav ünti: antag antag künî ... özlüglîrîg ößürsîz ücîn ökûnîp tuyumîp ... ‘When the ruler of the Underworld opened it and read it, such and such a content emerged from it: On such and such a day he was sorry for and repented for having killed living beings ...’. Another such element is bo montag in birök ... nâ năgî iš išlăgâli ugrasar ol ugrarda “bo montag tûl tûşâyök mân” tep sözläyür ârdi (U III 54,15) ‘Whenever she intended to commit something ... she used to say ‘I have just had such and such a dream’’. The narrator does not wish to supply the contents of queen Bladra’s purported dreams but still wants to paint a vivid picture of her behaviour.

The demonstrative conjunction anêçîp ‘doing that, thereupon’ appears to have come about through the addition of the converb suffix -(X)p to an+çî(a). It has turned up only in runiform sources, in the inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire (SU E7 & 8, W1 & 4 and Tes 8 & 14) and in the epilogue to the IrqB. anêçîp disappeared at an early stage; Uygur (disregarding the IrqB) no longer has it. Uygur încîp (presented further on in this section) would similarly have come from încça with the same

353 The EDPT assumes a contraction from anêça ār-ip as the source of this form. Such far-reaching contractions are not otherwise known from the Old (or Proto-) Turkic stage. Phonic regularity can, admittedly, not to be expected when a conjunction (which tends to be a relatively short element) is to be derived from a pronoun; but neither can word-class regularity: An unusual necessity as the creation of a demonstrative conjunction can also have stretched morphology to an unusual feat.
converb suffix. The uses and meanings of both words are discussed in section 3.33.

\( \text{anêc} \text{gine} \text{c}a \) ‘then, thereupon, in the meantime’ appears to have been formed in similar fashion: It probably comes from \( \text{anê} \text{c}a \) and the temporal converb suffix \(-\text{g}n\text{C}A\), which has the meaning ‘until’ with perfective verbs. The word is spelled with \( \Gamma \) in Manichaen writing, which has no similarity to \( \text{heth} \); this means that it does not come from \( \text{anêc} \text{a} \text{ ok} \). The three instances quoted in the UW entry for \( \text{anêc} \text{gine} \text{c}a \) spell it with double-dotted \( \text{heth} \) in Uygur writing, which would speak for a voiceless velar, but the Manichaen instance is more dependable for etymology; \( \text{anêc} \text{a} \) might have had a secondary analogical influence. The phrase \( \text{anêc} \text{gine} \text{c}a \text{ kan} \) is discussed in section 3.34.

The presentative interjections \( \text{una} \) and \( \text{ona} \) or \( \text{una} \) (not attested in any script which would enable a choice between \( /o/ \) and \( /u/ \)) are discussed in section 3.4; see below in this section for a possible instance of a similarly formed \( \text{ina} \). These elements are not datives, as one might think, as there is no evidence for the dative suffix to have lost its velar in Old Turkic; they may, however, be remnants of some prehistoric case form.

The plural demonstrative pronouns (e.g. \( \text{olargaru} \) in ManUigFr r 11, \( \text{olarni} \) in Pothi 99, \( \text{olarka} \) in Pothi 165 and 227, \( \text{olarn} \text{i} \) and \( \text{olarta} \) quite a number of times in Abhi, etc.) are not found in the runiform inscriptions, except perhaps a single instance of \( \text{olar} \). This reminds one of the fact that, in the earliest texts, the singular possessive suffix is used also for pluralic possessors. \( \text{olar} \) is never spelled with two \( \text{L} \)'s; there is therefore a (slight) possibility that the \( /\text{ll}/ \) in the singular form \( \text{ol} \), which stands alone in the whole pronominal domain, comes from a back-formation of the plural form. The process \( /\text{ll}/ > /\text{l}/ \) (documented in section 2.405 above) is, however, clearly an early one and \( \text{el} \text{it} \text{ig} \) ‘king’ < \( \text{el} + \text{iti} \text{g} \) is also never spelled with \( \text{LL} \).

Forms with double case suffixation having \( \text{+}\text{C}A \) as first element are \( \text{munçe} \text{da} \) (M II 5,8,) and \( \text{ançe} \text{d}a \) ‘then’ (usually spelled with \( \text{t} \) and correlating with \( \text{nâc} \text{da} \) ‘when’), \( \text{munçe} \text{lay} \text{u} \) (see OTWF 410 for examples) and \( \text{ançe} \text{lay} \text{u} \) ‘thus’ with raised middle vowels, \( \text{munçe} \text{an} \) (HTs V 21,3) and \( \text{ançe} \text{an} \) ‘a bit; gradually’,\(^{354}\) and \( \text{ançe} \text{aka} \), which is

---

\(^{354}\) The UW states that \( \text{ançe} \text{an} \) comes from its \( \text{ançe} \) II, which it translates as ‘diese Zeit, jene Zeit’. By meaning, however, this word accords with the one mentioned for \( \text{ançe} \) under (I) A, b, viz. ‘a little bit’ (the instrumental suffix is added to this merely to signal adverbial use), \( \text{ançe} \text{bya} \) ‘just a little bit’ (which also has an entry in the UW), also comes from this same \( \text{ançe} \) and not from Röhborn’s \( \text{ançe} \) II. He should therefore either
attested only in the common phrase ančaša täği ‘till then’ (always spelled as one word). It remains unclear what relationship there is between ančulašu and ančulaš, a rare Manichæan synonym used in correlation with kaltï. In ančaša bārũ (DKPAMPb 641) and ančašaš bārũ,355 munčaša bārũ (M II 5.8) ‘since this much time’ or ančaša ken (Suv 625.21) ‘from then on’, the second suffix is governed by the postposition. Uygur evidence for the anča+ and anta+ forms can be found in the UW. One might expect ančašaš bārũ to signify something like ‘after all that time’ whereas antaša bārũ is ‘since then’.

mundirtiš (KIP, TT VIII) and muntriran (e.g. HTs III 155), andīrtiš ‘from there’ and antiran (also antran e.g. in MaitH XX 14r7, antiran, antaran e.g. in MaitH Y 230) ‘from there, away; thereafter’ show an intercalary element +dIr+ which has no independent existence in Turkic; cf. +dUr, the main variant of the dative suffix in Mongolic.356 This element is attested also in mintirtiš ‘from me’ and sindirtiš ‘from you’, where it is added to personal pronouns, and in the interrogative kantiran / kantarən ‘from where’. Outside the pronominal domain we have a small group of +dXrI+ forms from orientational bases discussed in section 3.31, ištərtiš ‘from above’, ićərtiš ‘innerly’, kedirtiš ‘from behind’ and őŋdərtiš ‘from the front’, and ičərtiš ünməš ‘emerged from inside (the palace)’ in HTs VII 1113, with the ablative suffix.357 The suffix in kün-tüz ‘during daytime’ seems to be the only case where it appears by itself, with word-final zetacism. The exact semantic or functional difference between the demonstratives with +dIr/dXr+ and their simple ablative forms remains unclear. It is noteworthy that the dative is the only primary adverbial case form not used as first element in any double-case sequence of demonstrative pronouns; Old Turkic +dXr+ / +dIr+ might thus originally have been an allomorph of the dative suffix, which it is in Mongolic.

355 Probably to be read in a document referred to in UW under anındınbārũ.
356 /U/ is the regular Mongolic cognate of /X/ while the Turkic instances point towards /I/ in their suffix when added to demonstratives (unless the rounding in the second syllable is secondary). Cf. +dXrI below; neither that nor the forms with the personal pronouns, nor kün+ṭüz ‘during the day’ speak for /I/.
357 taši[rə]tün külp ‘coming from outside’ has been restituted by the editors in MaitH Y 164. This conjecture must remain questionable in view of tašdandan / tašdindin with exactly the same meaning in the ŠU inscription.
The accusative is not involved in any case suffix sequence in this sense, but serves as oblique base.\textsuperscript{358}

The most ‘combinable’ case suffix with demonstrative pronouns appears to be +dA,\textsuperscript{359} from which we have antača ‘there’ (documented in the UW) and mundaća ‘here’ (Abhi A 3071 together with andača). antada is ‘there; then’; but the second +dA can also be ablatal, in the comparative construction when followed by an adjective, and in antada bērū ‘from then on, since then’. antadata bērū, which is a hapax in the Xw, is either an error or it follows the logic of linking the construction of antada bērū with the meaning ‘then’ of antada. Beside muntadan (M III 23,9) and antadan or antadin (Tes 13, a runiform inscription; third vowel not explicit) we have the much more common muntada (muntuda in KP 34,8 and 37,4) ‘herefrom’. It is often (Mait) governed by ken with the meaning ‘hereafter’, by öprü to give ‘before’, by ǔstiń to give ‘above this’, by ㏌a to give ‘beyond this’, by ulati (also in BT II 623 and 1315 and often Suv and Tattvārtha) to give ‘beside this’; in Suv and Tattvārtha we often find muntada adin meaning ‘except this’. Some of these expressions are found also with a variant mındada, e.g. mındada adin in one of the two mss. in Suv 9,1, mındada ken in Mait 136r5 and MaitH XIII 4v19, mındida in[a]ru in Mait 8v27, mındada ozmšt katrulmšt ārmšt săn ‘you have not (yet) been saved from this situation’ in Mait 116v9, bilgā biligen mındada utduʒ yegādiŋ (U II 21,11) ‘With wisdom you have succeeded in this matter’. In his Mait edition, Ş. Tekin had translated the Mait 136r5 instance as “an meiner Stelle”,\textsuperscript{360} and the Mait 8v27 instance as ‘von mir an’, as he read the word I have transcribed as mındada / mındida as mintadā / mintidā and thought it was an oblique form of măn ‘I’; mındidā does indeed exist (e.g. in Mait 187r11 quoted in the previous section), and the only thing which makes this reading less likely here is the context.

\textsuperscript{358} munılayu and anılayu are here not treated as double-case forms, as we have no +lAyU derivates from the simple bases, as other pronouns use the accusative form as oblique base and as the presence of its morpheme can hardly have been motivated by government or by meaning. Concerning the dative cf. ümdı+gā+cā in Rabğızı 171,18 as quoted by Schinkewitsch 1926: 24.

\textsuperscript{359} Turkish in fact has a similar combinability, with o+ra+da, o+ra+dan etc. formed from a base signifying ‘there’. The UW uses the term ‘Hypostase’ for the first element; that would imply that the stem + first case suffix are equivalent to a nominative, which is not the case when considered from a content point of view. Rather, the Old Turkic state of affairs has something from the prepositional combinability we see in English from under the table.

\textsuperscript{360} This is also the translation supplied by Geng et al. for MaitH XIII, 4v19.
The hapax anïn in Suv 26,18 appears to be governed by ken, the phrase signifying ‘thereafter’.\footnote{After anïn there is a hole for the cord binding the leaves together, and it has been thought that there is a lacuna between that hole and ken. The ablative must, however, have been governed by ken (the passage is not otherwise fragmentary, as written in the UW), and it seems possible that nothing was written in that torn stretch. Zieme in his reedition writes anïn [as] j k and translates “davor (?) [oder] danach” but I don’t think it is possible for anïn to signify “davor”. If it were certain that a word is missing, Kaya’s a’shu would fit the context better. No Berlin fragments have been discovered for this passage.} If this is not a copyist’s error for ançañn, it might follow the late replacement of the accusative of pronouns by their genitive when governed by postpositions.

anta and munta are made adnominal with +ki, the converter discussed in section 3.126. Examples for antaki can be found in the UW; an example for muntaki is muntaki yörüg (BT I A 15) ‘the interpretation to be found in this’. +ki can, of course, be added also to plural demonstratives, as in bo+lar+ta+ki+g in Abhi A 727; this form also shows that the +ki expansion of a pronoun need not get the pronominal variant of the accusative suffix (i.e. +nI).

In view of pronominal forms like mïntada ‘from here on’ (the variant of muntada documented above) and bo kïnta mïnca ‘from today on’ (WP2.8 in SammlUigKontr 2 etc. and Murtuq 9; some examples of mïnca are quoted in the note thereto) alternating withs bo kïntin mïnca (Sa11,7 and 12,8 and 12 in SammlUigKontr 2) it seems conceivable that the rounding of the first vowel in the oblique forms muni etc. should be secondary and due to the rounding effect of the onset labial consonant.\footnote{Both are possible in the context but the editors have chosen the first translation.} The stems *bïn+ and *bun+ could, however, also have been distinct, as ūn+ differed from an+. Cf. also mïnta ken ‘in WP1,4 (SammlUigKontr 2): This is a demonstrative if it signifies hereafter’ but a personal pronoun if it signifies ‘after me’.\footnote{This is also from where I quote the instance in Mz 704 v15 mentioned above. The phrase was misunderstood by the EDPT, which considers it to be the ablative of a noun ‘apnîn’ but also erroneously proposes to emend it to a converb form ‘ap-matîn’.} An additional form of the stem mïn+, with the orientational formative +dXn, is found in the phrase intïn mïntïn ikidinki yer oronlar (ms. Mz 704 v15) ‘the places on both sides, this side and that side’ and presumably became also part of the petrified phrase äh©ntïn documented in UW 388.\footnote{See section 2.402 for early vowel rounding due to onset labial consonants.}

ol is often used also as 3rd person pronoun to express verbal agency (discussed in section 3.22); in this function its use blends over into being a copula (cf. section 3.29). The phrase anta munta (e.g.
DKPAMPb 1184) signifies ‘in all sorts of places’; it thus lost its demonstrative force and got lexicalised.

Beside the stems bo / bun+ and an+ (and possibly *ðin+ as mentioned on the previous page) there also was a pronominal stem in+. The following case forms are attested: inča, which usually means ‘the following, in the following way’ (in general opposed to anča, which, in intratextual deixis, is anaphoric);\(^365\) intin ‘(the one) on the other side’ (opposed to muntin, e.g. in a ms. quoted in the note to BT I D 37, or muntin ‘the one on this side’, as mentioned in the previous paragraph); inaru ‘forward; from ... on’\(^366\) (opposed to kerü ‘backward’ < *ke+ ‘back’, or to bāri ‘hither’ as in the phrase inaru bāri ‘back and forth’ attested e.g. in TT X 513). ina, a demonstrative interjection (cf. section 3.4), may be attested in fragmentary context in BT XIII 5,63; as stated by the editor, its relationship to in+ would be similar to muna and ona or una with respect to bo / mun+ and ol / an+. There is, finally, the pro-
verbal inčip or inčip ‘that having happened; thus’, attested in Manichaean, Buddhist and Christian sources; see section 3.33 for its function. It appears to come from the hybrid addition of -(X)p to inča. ančip (discussed earlier in this section) is, on the other hand, attested only in inscriptions of the Uygur kaganate and in the equally runiform ms. IrqB. inaru is clearly related to inčaru, attested (with g\(^1\)) in ŠU N10 in the phrase anta inčaru ‘from then on, thereafter’. The form inčaru is unusual in that the dative and directive forms linked to the pronominal n otherwise appear with ŋ; it may be archaic or, alternately, an analogical restitution. The intermediate stage appears, according to the Thomsen-Wulff materials, to be attested in the Yenisey inscription E29,3 as ŋ\(^2\)r\(^1\)w, presumably to be read as inčaru.\(^367\) This is a rare bit of evidence, as there are, in the whole runiform corpus, only a few Yenisey inscriptions which distinguish between ŋ\(^1\) and ŋ\(^2\). It also shows that this stem vowel, like other instances of first syllable ŋ/ without adjacent /kl, turned up as [i], phonetically though not phonologically (since the second syllable is shown to have been back-harmonic by the

\(^{365}\) In a Mait passage quoted in UW 134a, ančama and inčama (see section 3.342 for the particle m̥) correlate as ‘as ... so’.

\(^{366}\) The EDPT confuses anaru (the directive of ol ‘that’) and inaru and lists the instances of both under the former. Another example occurs in Yos 62. From the DLT and the QB on, inaru is shortened to naru.

\(^{367}\) The Orkhon Turkic rule, whereby the only first-syllable vowels not made explicit were ŋ/ and ŋ/, did not hold in many Yenisey inscriptions. It cannot, on the other hand, be quite excluded that ŋ\(^2\) was, in this case, used for ŋ\(^1\) (as is always the case in the inscriptions of Mongolia).
second and third runiform characters). This stem reminds one of the Mongolian genitive pronominal form inu.\textsuperscript{368} inčā must have had a variant inčā since, together with the particle (O)k, we get both inčāk (generally) and inčak (spelled with double-dotted Q in Manichæan writing in M I 7,17).\textsuperscript{369} Brāhmī also helps to show that both inča and inčā existed, since we find the second vowel spelled as a in TT VIII H 1 but as ā in TT VIII K and O (twice). It further helps in determining (with two instances) the reading of inaru as having back and not front vowels. The runiform script is of no use, on the other hand, in distinguishing between the front and back possibilities, as the signs for I, A and the ligature nč are all indifferent to palatal harmony. inčip can also very well have existed beside inčip; the runiform script would again be of no help, as the sign for p is also neutral. The back vocalism of intin follows from the form intińtakī ‘what is beyond it’ attested in Suv with X. While inča can be related to Mongolian inu mentioned above, inčā reminds one of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person possessive suffix, which may have had a consistent front vowel in Proto-Turkic, i.e. not to have followed synharmonism:\textsuperscript{370} There are some reasons for believing that +I(n)+ and +sI(n)+ once were two distinct and independent pronouns which subsequently got morphologized into complementary distribution; the former would then be identical with the stem of inčā. In Gabain 1974: 92 we find that the list of in+ / in+ forms has the title ‘Reste der 3. Person (?)’; the meanings which these forms have does not speak for this hypothesis, but the possible link with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person possessive suffix does. On the other hand, the source for inčā and inčip clearly was the fronting of first-syllable īl, which altered the harmony class of many one-syllable stems (here especially with the fronting effect of ē; see section 2.23). In that sense, any consistently fronted +(s)i(n+ may also be secondary. Doerfer in a 1964 paper quoted in Zieme 1969: 255 also expressed the view that the pronoun must have had back vowels, citing Tuvan inča. In section 3.234 below I propose that the future suffix -gAy should come from the -gA (discussed as a formative in section 3.113) through the addition of the nominative of *i / *i before ol replaced it as clitic personal pronoun. In view of the

\textsuperscript{368} This comes from *i+nu, as the second vowel is not ā; cf. the Manchu 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronoun i, which has in+ as oblique stem.

\textsuperscript{369} The word spelled with the N+Č ligature and k\textsuperscript{2} in runiform U 5 (TM 342) v2 is presumably also to be read as inčāk although it lacks a vowel sign in the beginning, as no ‘unčā’ is otherwise known to exist; ikim in r10 is spelled with an I the beginning.

\textsuperscript{370} Thus still today in Chuvash, possibly secondarily also in some other Turkic languages and, according to the choice of consonants, in Orkhon Turkic.
opposition of *întîn* to *munîntîn* and of *înâru* to *bârû*, in+ appears to have had a ‘there’ deixis. This accords with its link to the 3rd person. The adjective and postposition *sîñâr* ‘side; one of two; in the direction of’ may originally have been the dative of +*sl(n)+*, the other possessive suffix, while *sîñâru* ‘in the direction of’, posited as a postposition in Hesche 2001, may have been its directive.

3.133 Reflexives

*kântü* ‘own, one’s self’ (in Uygur practically always spelled as KNTW) is linked to the expression of number, possession and case, expressed e.g. in *bodîsâtvlâr kântülârîni enên mângisîn tilâmâdîn* ‘the bodhisattvas do not pursue their own peace and happiness but ... (Suv 227,14); its declension differs from nominal declension only in the accusative *kântü+nî* (e.g. in DreiPrinz 14). Other forms are the genitive *kântûnûn*, the dative *kântûkâ* and the instrumental *kântûn* ‘by itself’. Here are examples of its use to stress the identity of a verb’s subject in whatever person: *âdgü elînî kântü yanîltîg* (KT E 23 & BQ E 19) ‘You yourself erred towards your good country’; *kântü tugmîsh kîlînîsî mângisî tâgîrî yerîn unîtu îtî* (Xw 14) ‘He completely forgot the divine land of gods where he himself was born’; *kântî on âdgü kîlmê kîzâdîm* (MaitH XV 13r16) ‘I myself observed the ten good deeds’.371 *kântü* can also get governed by postpositions; e.g. in the following example, in which it is used anaphorically: *yana olok yâklâr iêkâklâr yêgûdûlûr tîltag bolûlûr kântûlûrîni üzê elînûlûr* (TT VI 267 f.) ‘Again those same demons prevail; they (the ignorants) are the cause and they (the demons) rule over them (i.e. over the ignorants)’. *kântü* is also used attributively, for stressing possessive suffixes (where *öz* is possible as well): inscriptional *kântû bodûnum* (KT N 4, ŠU E2) ‘my own people’; Manichaean *kîn t(à)gîrî ... kâjîntû yaroqîn kamakga yaroqîn*372 (M III 7 I r 9) ‘The sun ... shines on everything with its own light’; Buddhist *kântü köyjûlûm üzê alkunî ëkûnûn mâ* (Suv 100,23) ‘I repent for everything with my own heart’, or *känti kölmêlîg arîg yüzîk sûv*373 *üzê kântü agîr ayîg kîlmêlîg kîrûrîn tâpçalûrîn yümûs arîmîs kärûg* ‘One needs to wash away and clean the dirt and filth of one’s own grave sins by the pure and limpid water of repentance’ (Suv 142,1).

---

371 This function as well as the attributive use mentioned below are no doubt the reason why Tekin 1968 calls *kântü* and *öz* ‘intensive pronouns’.

372 Spelled YR’WQ’YNQM'TQ’ YR’WTYR.

373 I take *sav* of the Petersburg edition to be an error, since the context demands an extended metaphor of dirt getting washed away by pure water.
With käntü in the genitive: tesilär käntünü xoštisingä încä ve ep sezinê ayïlêr (M III 6 II v 10) ‘The disciples expressed doubts towards their teacher with the following words:’; note the singular possessive suffix. käntü käntü (runiform ms.; also e.g. Suv 19,15) is distributive ‘each his own’; e.g. KP 2,5: adrok uzlar käntü käntü uz išin išläyûr ‘Different specialists carry out each his own profession’. käntü is further used adverbially, to stress the identity of the subject of the verb; cf. käntün käntün (Saddh 39) ‘each for himself’.

öz, primarily a noun signifying ‘innermost (part)’, became the pronoun ‘self’; it is very well attested with this meaning already in Orkhon Turkic. An Uygur example would be özlärin saklanu ... tâzgûrû tutunlûr (M III text 20, 38,61 + ZiemeTexterg II) ‘Let them keep themselves guarded and evasive’. With possessive suffix and dative, öz is a mark of the self-beneficiary: el[ig] bûy ... özînä olorgû av etdûrti (HTs III 739), e.g. signifies ‘The ruler ... had a house made for himself to live in’.

öz can be used in a subordinated construction merely for referring to the subject of the main clause; e.g. birôk özînä kilmagu tûg nû nûgî iš išlägûlî ugrasår ‘...’tep sözlâyûr àrdi ‘if, however, she intended to do something which she wasn’t supposed to do, she would say ”...”’ (U III 54,15). özînä here refers to the subject of both išlägûlî ugra- ‘to intend to do’ and sözlâ- ‘to say’; it is neither reflexive nor focalised.

Thus instead of the expected tetsilär.

374 öz is used in the expression özînä kilmagu tûg which qualifies iš, the object of išlägûlî ugra-. It appears in the dative because the action is unsuitable for the subject.

375 Öz is used in the expression özînä kilmagu tûg which qualifies iš, the object of išlägûlî ugra-. It appears in the dative because the action is unsuitable for the subject.
as topic or for stressing their identity: bân özüm tavgač elinä kılıntim ‘I myself was born in China’ (Tünü 1); ılitбирözi kälti ‘The governor himself came’ (KÇ E9) It can also follow genitives of personal pronouns for rhematization; e.g. alko tünïlgalar manïn yâtım yamâzlâr. ogultâ këta amran manïn öz kisiilârim ârirlâr ‘... they are my own people, dearer (to me) than sons and daughters’. Note that köz needs no possessive suffix in mâm kiumtkä ... öz közün âdgu îrû bâglûlôr körmišimkä (HTs) ‘since I had, in my earliest childhood, seen good omens and signs with my own eyes, ...’.

Further, öz+ıüm refers to speakers, öz+i to subjects, especially when they become new topics opposed to the previous ones, serving the verb as subject in apposition to its subject reference. This is very common in Orkhon Turkic, e.g. xagan uçdokta özüm sâkiz yaşda çältım (BO E 14) ‘when the king died I was left behind, seven years old’. In özüm amti açünur mân ‘I am now confessing’ (confession quoted from Suy by Bang & Gabain in Uigurische Studien l.35) or sü yördi, özümün öjrâ biya baši âtti (ȘU) ‘He marched out and sent me forward as captain’ öz+ıüm is object. In özümüjçä ‘like his own’ in M III text 8 VII r 14, öz receives two case suffixes.377

Finally, öz öz signifies ‘each his own’, like kântü kântü mentioned above; e.g. in bo üç reginlär öz öz köntülârintäki sakınımış savlarin sözlâšip ... (Suv 609,12) ‘These three princes discussed the matters which each one of them had thought in his heart’ or eliglär bâglär öz öz uluška bardîlär (U III 54,7) ‘The kings and lords went each to his own realm’.

ät’öz ‘body’ appears sometimes (though rarely) to be used as ref lexive pronoun, as pointed out in OTWF 752 discussing the sentence ät’özün ketûri tâzgürür bolur (HTs X 549-50) ‘He becomes reticent’.

3.134. Interrogative-indefinites
The interrogative-indefinite pronouns are kâm/kim ‘who’, nä ‘what’ and the pronouns from the stems ka+ and kañu ‘which’, this latter possibly an expansion of ka+.378 The set of pronouns discussed in this section

---

377 The matter is discussed towards the end of section 3.124.
378 The table below lists forms of both kañu and kayu, because the former changed into the latter with the fusion of î/i and iy/i in the course of the history of Old Turkic; the table only mentions those forms of kañu which I have found to be attested. Bang 1917: 27-33, dealing with a number of derivations from ka+ in the Turkic languages, proposes the second syllable of kayu to be a different pronoun, but no such pronoun is attested anywhere in Turkic.
unites different functions (as happens with such pronouns in a wide variety of languages): They serve with interrogative content, given in the first line of the table, but also as indefinites, i.e. they can also signify ‘anyone’, ‘anything’, ‘anywhere’ and ‘any’ respectively. Some of these elements are secondarily also used as relative pronouns. The distinction \textit{kim} / \textit{nä} grammaticalizes an ‘animate’ / ‘inanimate’ opposition not relevant elsewhere in the grammar, with the position of animals an interesting middle in view of the Buddhist doctrine to which the authors of most of our texts adhere. All interrogative-indefinite pronouns can, in principle be used either as NPs by themselves or appear attributively, both in interrogative and indefinite use.

\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
Nom. & ‘who’ & ‘what’ & ‘where’ & ‘which’ \\
\textit{käm} / \textit{kim} & \textit{nä} & \textit{kaňu} / \textit{kayu} \\
Gen. & \textit{kimiɲ} / \textit{kimniɲ} (näŋ) & \textit{kayunuŋ} \\
Dat. & \textit{kämkı} / \textit{kimkı} & \textit{nakä} & \textit{kaŋa} & \textit{kaŋuka} \\
Acc. & \textit{kimni} & \textit{kaŋuni} \\
Loc. & \textit{kimtӓdä} & \textit{nädä} & \textit{kanta} & \textit{kaňuda} / \textit{kaŋuda} \\
Abl. & & \textit{kantan} & \textit{kayudın} \\
Equ. & \textit{näčä} & \textit{kanča} \\
Dir. & \textit{kaŋugaru} \\
\end{tabular}

These pronouns have a rich case declension; additional irregular case forms not listed in the table are mentioned below. Their number declension is rather weak: We find \textit{kimlär} e.g. in MaitH XXV 2v20 or BT I A.15 and E11, \textit{kayular} e.g. in TT V B2.

The plural of \textit{nä} appears to have been \textit{nägü}, formed with the collective suffix +\textit{(A)gU}; see OTWF 95. There are more instances in IrqB XXIV, U IV A.41, HTs VII 1995 and Suv 610.11 and 621.4; e.g. \textit{takĩ nägü kütär sizlär} (U I 43,7) ‘What else are you waiting for?’. \textit{nä nägü iš} (U III 54,13) is ‘any sort of business’. \textit{nägü} inflects for case as, e.g., \textit{nägendä otgürı} (U II 5,14) ‘through what things’. \textit{näg(ü)lük} ‘what for; to what purpose; why’ is a derivate from \textit{nägü}, attested e.g. in U IV A.26, Suv 612.8, KP 4.9, 30.1 and 66.6 and often elsewhere. \textit{nägük} (twice Suv) apparently comes from \textit{nägü} (iö)k with the emphatic particle.

With possessive suffix we find e.g. \textit{kim+i} ‘who among them’ in \textit{kimı ärtür kimi ärmätz} (Abhi B1405) and \textit{kayu+sĩga} (KP 6,2) ‘for which of them’; the referents of the possessive suffixes are the groups from...

\footnote{379 This also holds for \textit{kim} which is, in Republican Turkish, not used attributively but replaced by \textit{nä} in this function.}
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within which the pronouns select their referents. *kim+iŋā* (as well as *nāgü+iŋā* and *nā+iŋā* reconstructed there) are in WP6,28-30 (SammlUigKontr 2) used in indefinite meaning, with the possessive suffix referring to a possessor in the strict sense: *baŋŋa borlukŋa nāgü[iŋā] kimŋā basa ... anŋ aŋŋa tavaŋŋa nā[iŋā] kimŋā ... ‘concerning his ... vineyards and anything or anybody belonging to him ... his possessions, anything or anybody he possesses’; the contract covers a transaction both of land and of slaves.

The nominative and the dative of *kim* ‘who’ appear as *kām* and *kāmkā* in the Orkhon inscriptions (KT E9 and 22 and BQ E19), no other case forms being attested there. *kām* must also be read in the runiform ms. Blatt 27, as the vowel of this word is implicit and first-syllable [i] is written out explicitly everywhere in that ms. Originally there probably was an apophony *kām* (low vowel in the nominative) vs. *kim*+ (high vowel in the oblique cases), with the same alternation as found for the demonstrative and personal pronouns. This hypothesis would explain why this pronoun turns up in so many shapes in the Turkic languages (e.g. *kam* < *kām* in Chuvash). In fact, however, *kām* appears as the only stem in the Orkhon dialect, while Uygur sources (including BuddhKat, which is in Tibetan script) have *kim* in all forms. So it may also be the case that the Old Turkic dialects settled for one or the other stem of this pronoun already at this early stage (the 9th century, at the latest).

Like *kāntū*, *kim* and *nā* have the nominal case forms, except that *kim* gets the accusative alternant +ni (which is itself gradually introduced into the nominal declension in the course of the development of Old Turkic); e.g. in *kimni ucūn* (U III 22,5) ‘for whose sake’. The genitive practically always has +niŋ; *[k]imiŋ ol* ‘Whose is it?’ in Yos 52 (an early text) can, however, hardly be reconstructed in any other way (the facs. is clear). The accusative of *nā* may not have been in use at all. *kimkā*, *nācā* (e.g. Suv 118,4, Xw 80, U III 73,2, M I 7,12 and 15,6), *nādā* (e.g. Xw 135 and 137 and M III Nr.6 II v 13), *nākā* ‘why’ (e.g. Tuñ 40 and KP 5,2) have no ‘pronominal n’. Nor does *nā tāg* ‘like what’ (e.g. IrqB, M I 23,6), unlike its demonstrative counterparts *antag* and *montag*. The only exception appears to be *nāncā* in fragmentary context in BQ N 9, of which Thomsen says ‘leçon qui me parait sûre’. *kač* (see below) also appears to be a derive from *ka+* lacking the pronominal n. A form *kimtādā* appears in ablative use in *s(ā)jn bo*

---

380 The /ā/ is certain: The 31 line ms. has only one instance of implicit /ā/ and that is in a second syllable; the text generally only makes (non-long) /ā/ and /ā/ implicit.

381 See section 3.341 for a form spelled *kimniŋ* which is not a genitive.
užakag kimtäđa bošguntunj? (MaitH XI 15v25) ‘From whom did you learn this alphabet?’ A pure locative of kim may not be attested because persons (which is what kim asks about) are not ‘places’ for things to be ‘at’.

näŋ ‘thing’ is here taken to come from an obsolete genitive of nä which, in indefinite use, signifies ‘anything’; Bang 1917: 18 already links näŋ with nä. The same must be the source of the particle näŋ, which stresses negation. In Tuñ 56 näŋ is used in a way not (I think) attested anywhere else, again with the meaning ‘any’: näŋ yerđaki xaganlıg bodunka bintägi bar ārsär nä buñi bar ārtäčä ārmış ‘If an independent nation anywhere were to have one like me, what trouble could it ever have?’.

näčä ‘how much, how many; inasmuch as’ becomes a stem for secondary case forms, as näčäđa ‘at some time, at some stage; whenever’ (U III 43,19, HTs VIII 83, BT I D 291, TT X 539 etc.). It also gets governed by postpositions and then appears in the case forms they demand; e.g. näčäkä tågi ‘insofar as’ (e.g. in M I 16,16) or näčäkä ken ‘after some time’ (e.g. in Suv 619,18). These forms correlate with anča, ančada, ančaka tågi etc. in complex sentences in which the interrogative form appears in a -sAr clause, the demonstrative form in the main clause (see section 4.65). kim is also attested with double case suffixation in bo užakag kimtäđa bošguntunj? (see above). 

nätägläti (Suv 65,22 and 588,16), birtämläti ‘once and for all’ and kaltï (see below) to be formed with two adverb-forming suffixes, +IA and +I. nâmän, an instrumental

A number of modern words for ‘thing’, like nimä or närzä, also come from ‘what’; South Siberian ‘thing’ words like ču and ču come from Mongolic ‘what’.

See section 3.341. Stressing negation is also one use of English ‘any’, and cf. French ne ... rien < Latin rem ‘thing (acc.)’.

Cf. section 3.31. We are aware of the similarity of +Ia to +IA- and of +I to the second part of the negative converb suffix -mAtI which presumably was a converb in its
expansion from namä < *nā ymā attested e.g. in BT I A 14, and HTsBiogr. 27 and 54, appears to be an interjectional interrogative with a meaning like ‘how!’ or ‘what?’.

The nominative of *ka+ is not attested;\(^{385}\) nor do we have its accusative or genitive, the other two cases with abstract meaning. A common case form from this stem is kanta ‘where’ (e.g. Wettkampf 28, KP 58,4, BT I A 1, DKPAMPb 843, several times in Suv all spelled with T). DLT fol. 38 spells the form with dāl (not dḥāl) and TT VIII F 7 (brāhmi) has kanda; what is spelled kanta was therefore pronounced with the stop [d] (see section 2.409). We also have the ablative kanda (Orkhon Turkic: KT E23 twice and the parallel text BQ E19 twice, all spelled with the NT/ND ligature) and kan+tir+an (Uygur, e.g. Suv 390,2: kantar in MaitH XV 7r4) ‘from where’. kanča can signify ‘how much’ (e.g. U III 36,10) or ‘how far’, ‘where to’, ‘by which way’ (e.g. U II 25,21, DKPAMPb 840 etc. with bar-). kana ‘to which place’ is attested in Mait 12v21: ätözümək kiecmel sin karımak eliti bardig; kana yatzum? ‘Old age, you have taken away the force in my body; where should it (i.e. my body) lie down?’. kana is exceedingly rare; the ‘movement to’ meaning otherwise typical for the dative appears, for this base, to be covered by kanča, e.g. in kanča barir siz (KP 78,1-2) ‘Where are you going?’.

Kani ‘where?’ serves in regular and rhetorical questions (cf. part V); it has accusative shape but serves no direct object function. It is used twice in Orkhon Turkic and appears nearly 70 times in DLT and QB but I have come across only a single Uygur example.

The meaning and use of kač ‘how much’ must have been close to that of nāča, but kač may have been used only adnominally (kač kata, kač küm, kač yil, kač törľüg, kač yanřig, kač bolük, kač iğac etc.) whereas nāča was mainly used pro-nominally in the narrow sense of the term, i.e. governed by verbs. kač being morphologically more opaque, one would in principle expect it to be older than nāča. It may gradually have been replaced by nāča, as the Suv, e.g. appears to have had only two examples of kač (both kač törľüg) but more than 70 examples of

---

\(^{385}\) It may have survived in Khalaj, though Doerfer (1988: 108 and elsewhere) does not express himself very clearly on this: What is actually attested may only be qāyan ‘where to’, which seems to consist of qā fused with yan ‘side’ (cf. kan+tan yan in Tuñ and other such forms with vowel harmony, in section 3.32). Khalaj kā may also be a contraction of the dative form. Note that standard Republican Turkish does not have nere either (though it has nere+de ‘where’ etc. and, for the nominative, nere+si ‘what place’).
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načă. kač is probably derived through a short variant of the equative suffix, the full form presumably serving as base to kačan ‘when’ (< *ka+ča+n with the instrumental).

kačan is rarely interrogative (there is such an instance e.g. in Aranemi/Zeime 83) but is used as an indefinite element signifying ‘at some point in time’; two examples for that are quoted further on in this section, some additional ones in section 3.31. It often introduces temporal clauses with -sAr or with -dOtA (section 4.633). načadă is also temporal and might be translated as ‘at some stage’; this is another case of competition between ka° and nā stems.

kalti is attested as interrogative pronoun in IrqB 45, in the sentence kalti uyin ‘How should I get on?’. It presumably comes from ka+lai, with the middle vowel syncopated due to strong accent on the first syllable: The ka° forms appear to have first syllable stress, as we see from modern forms such as kancă, hangi, hani, xačan, hara etc.. The sequence sLAI+I is earlier in this section documented also from other interrogative bases.387 qalti is attested as an element introducing object clauses of content in yarokl karali kalti katilmış ... tepăn biltimiz (Xw 135) ‘we know how light and darkness were mixed’ and is also used as a particle signifying ‘for instance’; it is often found in comparative clauses (section 4.632). kalı appears instead of kalti in Qarakhanid, where it is rather common. In DLT fol.549 we read that it signifies ‘how’ or ‘if only’ or ‘when’ and get examples for two of these meanings; here is the interrogative one: sân bu išg kalı kilti ‘How did you do this affair?’. No etymological explanation for kalı is forthcoming; it could also (though attested less early) have actually been the source of kalti.

kañu > kayu ‘which’ must also somehow be related to *ka+, though the exact relationship is, again, obscure. 12 among the Brāhmī and Tibetan script instances spell it with u, 7 with o and 3 (in BudhKat) have kayol < kay’ ol ‘which (is) it?’. We have opted for kayu, also because this variant appears in 8 different mss. whereas the 7 instances

386 Note that Turkish has only kač ‘how many’ but no načă (though it has nice in exclamatory or indefinite use in dialectal, literary or archaic language); it appears to have replaced načă by ne kadar. kač has to be adnominal also in Turkish, which means that there has to be a count word like tane in case the speaker wishes not to use it adnominally.

387 An instance in another runiform ms., TM 342 2v11 in Köktüturf appears in fragmentary context, as the facs. shows better than the edition; it can hardly be interpreted as in EDPT 618b.
of kayo are found only in the mss. TT VIII H and L.\textsuperscript{388} From kayu come kayunu and kayani (both attested e.g. in BT XIII 2,91), kayuka (BT XIII 38,30 and 21,67, Suv 375,21 and 22, 6 times in Abhi etc.) and kañi-garu (twice in ms. T I D 200 = Mz 774 last edited by Zieme in AoF VIII 242). kañi-da appears in U II 6,13 and 16; kayuda is common, e.g. DLT fol. 62 and TT VIII A 36 with dh, U II 29,11. The QB syncopates it to kayda to suit the metre; we also find e.g. kayda barsar ‘wherever he goes’ in Mi33,3 (SammlUigKontr 2), a contract. kayu-da ‘from where’ is also common, e.g. in BT I D267; kayutïn sï is parallel to antïn sï in U II 29,19. kayu+sï signifies ‘which of them’.

I will deal with kaçaniy in greater detail, because it has not yet been quite pinned down as to form or meaning, although attested a number of times in early texts. The word appears in the mentioned shape in the two Buddhist examples, ačmak suvsamak ämgäkimiz kaçaniy näj sönmüz (Mait 110v7) ‘Our suffering through hunger and thirst never ever ends’ and kaçaniy bolmazun (Alex 15) ‘May it never be!’ The three runiform examples in Tuñ have no vowels: anaru sülämiśär k’ên’ä ärśär ol bizi – xaganä alp ärmiś, ayguëisi bilgä ärmiś – k’ên’ä ärśär öltürtçäik ök (Tuñ 20-21) ‘If (we) do not fight it (i.e. the Türk confederation) it will, at some stage – its ruler is said to be valiant and his advisors are said to be clever – it will definitely kill us at any time’. The Tuñ 29 instance of the term (with a formulation very close to Tuñ 20-21, also with ärśär) is spelled with ñ² as in Tuñ 20, which should, I think, be explained by the fronting influence of the /ï/ (as happens often in these inscriptions).\textsuperscript{389} The four Manichæan examples have a single explicit vowel each; the third vowel is explicit in none of them but we can take it to have been /ï/ in view of the Mait and Alex instances: üzüti k(a)çan(ï)y [y] [v]vlak tö[r]t butlug üml(i)y özüja [ymä] kul kûn özüja

\textsuperscript{388} kaño may still have been the original form and it cannot be excluded that we would have found that more frequently if there had been earlier Brûhmi sources; Schöning 1995: 180-181 takes this (with unrounding) to have been the source of kaya found in some modern languages.

\textsuperscript{389} Reading Tuñ 20 and 29 as kaç näy and explaining ‘kaçanag’ in Tuñ 21 with secondary synharmonism would go well with the Manichæan examples but would leave the Mait and Alex instances with yod unexplained. Tekin 1994 reads kaçan näy in Tuñ 21 but retains kaç näy in the other two places; this is unlikely in view of perfect parallelism between the passages. Possibly all three Tuñ instances should be read as kaçanäy, especially if this is ultimately fused from kaçan näy (attested e.g. in Mait 11r11); the ñ¹ ~ ñ² variation would be explained by the /n/ being standing a back and a front vowel: Note that the the only Tuñ instance of näy by itself (l.56) also appears with a positive, not a negative verb. The high vowel of kaçanäy would be secondary.
If their souls should, at some stage, have been born in the body of an evil four-legged creature or the body of a male or female slave, ...; L'R barča kač(ani)ŋ kata۵۰۰ bulgantı irinç bollälar (M III Nr.1,IV v5) ‘The [...]s all so and so many times felt terrible and became wretched’: kač(ani)ŋ näŋ am(ani)ŋ äşgäkn(i)ŋ muyüz۵۰۱ örmüz (M I 16,11) ‘At no stage do horns ever grow on horses or donkeys’; another instance of kač(ani)ŋ näŋ appears in M I 32,6 in fragmentary context. In the two last-mentioned instances the word is followed by näŋ to strengthen a negation, as in the Mait instance.

In nä törlüg aš ašamışın ... näčä yaş yašamışın öyür ‘He remembers what sorts of food he ate, ... how many years he lived, ...’ (MaitH XV 2r4) nä and nöčä actually serve as relative pronouns, forming heads for object clauses; cf. also yüüz müny tümän ulaası näčä küči yetmişinçä söçläžün (TT V A 67) ‘Let him say it a hundred, a thousand, ten thousand or as many times as he is able to’. The correlative constructions mentioned below and discussed in section 4.65 also use such pronouns as relative pronouns. nä törlüg ‘what sort’, nä yaŋlıg ‘by what manner’ and the like also appear, of course, in interrogative sentences and subordinated interrogative clauses.

The indefinite function of these ‘interrogative’ pronouns turns up in nö ymä taštin siŋarkı bulgulärig nö ymä ičitin siŋarkı [bulgulärig] adruk adruk tiullärig koduru kololasar (MaitH XI 3r29-30) ‘if one meticulously examines whatever external and internal omens there are as well as the different dreams’, where, in fact, the two nö are used as a correlative pair. In the following two instances nö is taken up by barı or alku ‘all’, giving a generalizing meaning. In tagları i gač kaya kum barı kop basar (M III 8,3-5), the possessive suffix of tagları refers back to kün tügsukdünkä yer suv ‘the territory in the east’; the sentence should signify ‘(any of) the mountains (of that territory), shrubs and trees, rocks and sand, all put pressure’. Further, nö kärgäkin alku tükäti

۵۰۰ With reference to this passage Gabain 1974: 100 spells the word as ‘qaçaŋ’ because the second vowel is not explicit and N looks like alef; this is, however, the only instance with this spelling.

۵۰۱ Spelled MWY’WZY, and the editor assumes that the alef is of the superfluous sort; the text does in fact have a few superfluous alevs. Reading müynüz or muyüz would, however, be just as possible and might be considered in view of the general Turkic account given e.g. in the EDPT. müynüz in H I 55, DLT, Chagatay and modern Southeastern Turkic languages cannot be linked to the main Old Turkic variant within Old Turkic sound laws.
berip ... üntürdi (KP 28.4) ‘He fully gave him whatever he needed (= all he needed) and ... sent him off’. nə is here attributive to kärgiäk (note that ‘whatever’ is also derived from ‘what’) and the whole noun phrase is put into the accusative case.

We have indefinite kim, ‘whoever’, in oglanımi знäl altaçı kim oğrî àrsär anî tapalîm (DKPAMPb 164), which signifies ‘Whatever thief there is who robs our children, let us find him’. In HTsBiogr 294 and 301, kim m(ä)ñ and kim biz appear to signify ‘somebody like me’ and ‘people like us’ respectively. näçädä signifies ‘at some stage’: näçädä äçayasene bayagnun iki oglani bâdûk bûllilar, anîç arasînta kântu òzi ... ādin âžünkä bardî (U III 80.3-7) ‘Eventually the two sons of the merchant Jayasena became grown ups (but) in the meantime he himself died and passed to a different existence’, kaçan ‘at some point’ is used e.g. in kaçan eçisinîn [köl]mişin utgurak bîlî, anâ [ok...] kûntkâ bardî (U III 86.18) ‘At some point he got certain news that his elder brother had arrived, (so) he immediately went to the town (of Benares)’; a subordinative interpretation cannot be excluded, giving ‘When he got certain news that his elder brother had arrived, he immediately went to the town (of Benares)’. kaç is ‘a few, a number of’in kaç bârâ yer yorîsar (HTs III 764) ‘if one walks some miles’; tut[gal]î kaç kûn bolmadok (BT XIII 4.4) ‘It has been impossible to catch him for a number of days’; kaç kafîn toyîn eçîl kabişîp (PetInscr) ‘(we – eight proper names), quite a number of monks and lay people came together to ...’. Indefinite adnominal kayu ‘any’ can be found in BT II 257 or Helik I 180.

Indefinite pronouns can also be used together with the conditional form. In the following example we know that this is the case, as the clause is parallel to a normal conditional clause: alkışîniz òtûğûnûz täç riotarîn täçmîdî àrsär, nà yerdä tûündî tutundî àrsär ... (Xw 161-2) ‘If our praise and prayer did not arrive to heavens in purity, if they got hampered and hindered anywhere ...’. In hîrûk kayûda kaçan yalan ok âzûnta tuçmâkî bolsar ymä, ... ‘even if, however, he should anywhere at any time get born in a human birth form ...’ (U II 29, 11-12), the pronouns are also obviously indefinite. Otherwise, clauses where indefinite pronouns appear with the -sár form are discussed in section 4.65, which deals with correlative relativisation, and in section 4.633, which is about temporal clauses.

Phrases consisting of interrogative-indefinite pronouns + àrsär whose pronominal reference is not taken up in correlative manner are used for stressing the generality of a statement: ol sąya nà àrsär kärgiäk yok (DKPAMPb 352) ‘You don’t have any sort of need for that’. With kim:
There is nobody at all who would go to any trouble for me'; there is a further instance of kim ärsär yok in TT X 70. In burxanta adîn kimînä ärsär umug înag tilâp bulmaq biz (TT X 109-110) ‘We have not found anybody except Buddha to serve us as hope and support, though we are searching’ the indefinite pronoun is in the accusative. It seems that this construction can even be used adnominal: Doubled and with topicalising ärsär we have e.g. kayu kayu ärsär ânlaqlar ‘any living beings’ (MaitH XV 1v11). Numerous examples for interrogative-indefinites with ärsär, both adjacent and separate, in both adverbal and adnominal function, are quoted in UW 407-408 (part VII of the entry on âr-).

The same generalising doubling as in the last quoted example is applied – without ärsär – also in kim kim mà çam çarîm kîlmusunlar ‘let nobody whatsoever raise any objections’ (Sa10,12 and 11,14 in SammlUigKontr 2, the latter with bol-up after the particle mà);\(^{392}\) cf. also kantî kantî ‘each his own’. We have distributive doubling of nouns in açun açunta (Saddh 20 and DKPAMPb 282) ‘in every existence’. Doubling in correlation between relative and demonstrative pronouns: kaltî ânlaqlar kayu kayu yer suvda burxanlar yoliga kîrgüsi bar ârsär bodisatvlar ymâ ol ol yer suvda kîrülär (VimalaZieme 97-100) ‘If, by chance, creatures in any particular place are to enter the road of the buddhas, the bodhisattvas as well go in at that particular place’.

nä ärsär also comes to signify ‘any’ (discussed in section 3.341); nâzâ ‘thing’, which e.g. appears four times in Mi19 (SammlUigKontr 2), comes from this phrase.

kayu kayu remains interrogative in MaitH XI 14r28: kayu kayu bitig užak bol[ğun]galtî sakınur sân signifies ‘What alphabets do you think should be learned?’, it is followed by a listing of alphabet names and the speaker clearly expects the addressee to give the names of more than one alphabet.

In section 4.633 we quote temporal clauses starting with nâ `what’ and containing the vowel converb followed by the postposition birlâ or by birlâ ök, or containing the -(X)p converb (sometimes also followed by Ök), or the -sAr form; they all convey the meaning that the main action follows immediately upon the subordinated one. The source of this construction is not clear to me. -sAr and the vowel converb + birlâ are also used without nâ in this meaning, but the -(X)p converb is not.

\(^{392}\) This is akin to the doubling of bir for distributive meaning, and cf. ögi ögi ‘various’ in Pothi 235.
3.14. Numerals and quantification

Numerals are a morphological class by themselves, apart from being a lexical and syntactical class: The cardinal numerals serve as base for two forms not found with other word classes, the ordinals in \((+X)n\text{ö}c\) and the distributives in \((+r)Ar\). The Old Turkic counting system is decimal; there is a periodicity based on ten (\(\text{on}\)). The digits and decades are opaque up to \(\text{öl}\text{ig} \; \text{‘fifty’}\), this latter being identical with the word for \‘hand\’. \(\text{alt}m\text{ï} \; \text{‘sixty’}\) and \(\text{yet}m\text{ï} \; \text{‘seventy’}\) seem derived from \(\text{alt} \; \text{‘six’}\) and \(\text{yet} \; \text{‘seven’}\), though no appropriate suffix \(+mIš\) or \(+mXš\) is attested anywhere else. \‘Eighty’ and \‘ninety’ are \‘eight tens’ (\(\text{säkiz on}\)) and \‘nine tens’ (\(\text{tokuz on}\)); in the DLT these terms are fused to \(\text{säksön}\) and \(\text{tokson}\) respectively. The highest opaque numeral in common use is \(\text{tümän} \; \text{‘ten thousand’}\). The hundreds, thousands and ten thousands are expressed in multiplicative manner: \‘3700’ is \(\text{ü}ć \; \text{bũh (or mũh in Uygur)}\) \(\text{yeti yüz, ‘37000’ üć tümän yeti bũh (or mũh)}\).

The runiform inscriptions and the earlier Uygur texts form cardinals between the various decades from the second to the ninth in anticipating fashion: First stated is the digit as starting the count from the lower decade, then the higher decade is mentioned: \(\text{tört kïrk, ‘four forty’ (MaitH XV 10r11)}\), e.g., is \‘34’. In E10.5, the defunct topic of the grave inscription is quoted stating his age as \(\text{säkiz tokuz on yaśım, which signifies ‘I am 88 years old, literally ‘eight nine -ten my age: tokuz on ‘90’ is mentioned above. This strategy may have existed also outside the decimal system: In MaitH XV 14r4-26 we find the terms iki yeti kũntũ ..., üćüně yeti kũntũ ..., törtüně yeti kũntũ ...., bešině yeti kũntũ ..., altině yeti kũntũ ... and yetině yeti kũntũ ... signifying ‘on the second / third / fourth / fifth / sixth and seventh of the

\(^{393}\) From \(\text{ögrän- with nasal assimilation, unless a simple error.}\)

\(^{394}\) Or \(\text{yete}, \text{taking account of the optional vowel assimilation.}\)

\(^{395}\) Buddhist texts have names for much greater numbers, which are of Indian origin. \(\text{tümän} \) may actually also be a borrowed term (from Tokharian).
seven days’ used similar to bir otuz küntä ken (13v23) ‘after the 21st day’. In both cases the numeral serving as framework to the counting is placed between the denumerating numeral and the head with no affix or other element to show its function in the construction.

The members of the tenth decade cannot be formed in this manner, as altï yüz, literally ‘six hundred’, would be ‘600’ and not ‘96’: These are constructed with örkï from ör- ‘to rise’: sâkiz yüz altï örkï ‘896’. ‘103’ is yüz üe (MaitH XV 10v5) but ‘99’ is tokuz örkï (U 1426 r3 edited in Ehlers 1998). An instance expressing ‘99’ as yüzkä bir ägsük i.e. ‘one less than a hundred’ is quoted in the note to that passage.

Still another means for adding digits to decades or decades to hundreds etc., found in all periods, is to state the higher unit first, then artok+ï ‘its supplement’ and then the lower unit, as yüz artokï kïrk tümän (Xw 12) ‘1 400 000’ (literally ‘hundred plus forty myriad(s)’), otuz artokï bir yašïma (BQ E28) ‘when I was in my 31st year (i.e. when I was 30 years old)’ or tôrï yüz tokuz on artokï beš ‘495’ (literally ‘four hundred(s) nine ten(s) plus five’). beš yüz artokï äki otuzuncï yïlka (M I 12,15) ‘in the year 522’ and iki miñ iki yüz artokï beš kïrk (MaitH XXV 4r23) ‘2235’ combine both methods: äki otuz ‘22’ and beš kïrk ‘35’ have the constructions mentioned above. on artok yetï yïl (HTs VII 163) ‘17 years’ (with no possessive suffix on art-ok) is yet another possibility; classical and later texts can also leave artok away altogether, giving e.g. älig bir (DPKAMPb 85) ‘51’.

In Uygur yarïm is ‘half’, iki yarïm ‘two and a half’. In Orkhon Turkic and in inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire, sïgar appears to have been ‘half’ or ‘a part’: sïgar sïsi ävig bïrgïli bïrdi, sïgar sïsi sïyïgïldï kïltï (BQ E 32) ‘Half / Part of their army went to plunder (our) homes, half / a part came to fight (against us)’; sïgarï bodun içïkï, sïgarï blodun ... (ŠU E 6-7) ‘Half / Part of the people submitted, half / a part ...’.

Throughout Old Turkic from the Orkhon inscriptions till the very latest texts, äki / iki ‘2’ has the shape äkin / ikin when governed by the postposition ara ‘between’. Since postpositions govern the accusative form of stems with possessive suffixes, it appears that the second vowel of äki / iki was felt to be, or originally was, the possessive suffix (see section 4.21 for the construction). In that case, the first syllable may be *äk ‘addition, joint’, a word attested in the Oguz languages (in Turkmen with a long vowel), and äki may originally have signified ‘its addition’.

396 And not, apparently, ‘in the second, third ... week’. Ordinals are discussed further on in this section.
iki ülügi atlïg ärti, bir ülügi yadag ärti (Tuñ 4) is an example of how the early Turks expressed fractions, if (as usually translated) this signifies ‘Two thirds (literally ‘two of its parts’) were mounted, one third (literally ‘one of its parts’) were on foot’.

Distributive numerals are formed with the suffix +(r)Ar, as äkirär / ikirär ‘2 each’. In compound numerals, only the first element gets the distributive suffix: altïrar y(e)girmi (Höllen 50) is ‘16 each’, sâkizär tümnän (MaitH XXV 2r7) ‘80,000 each’, beşär yüz ärin barïp (KP 24,2) signifies ‘He had gone (there) every time with 500 men’ (not ‘beş yüza’). Note that the procedure is the same in the two examples, although ‘500’ is construed by multiplication, ‘16’ by addition. Distributives are normally found in adnominal function, as onar ârkä ‘for each 10 men’ (TT II,1 91) or birär ögretqatu (KP 79,5) ‘(hang on them) a bell each’. bir+är+kyä ‘just one each’ (four times in Suv 532,19-21) is not surprising, since +kyA has pragmatic functions and is not just a diminutive (see sections 3.111 and 5.3). Doubled distributives are used adverbially, e.g.: birär birär adakin bap kämišip yâjin kirkarlar (M III Nr. 14 v 3) ‘One by one they bind their (i.e. the sheep’s) feet, throw them down and shear their wool’; birär birär kölmiş (Yos 41) ‘He hobbled then one by one’. Simple bir can also be doubled to stress the fact of distribution: bir bir çunlarda signifies ‘in every single existence’. This is akin to the doubling of kayu ‘which’ giving ‘whichever’ and kim ‘who’ giving ‘whoever’ (examples in section 3.134).

In two economical texts involving the same persons there is an aberrant phrase involving ikirär: bo yerkä berim [a]lïm kälsä ikirär [ya]rïm biliðip [...] berïr biz and alïm berim kälsä ik(ï)rïr t(ï)yr biliðip t(ï)yr berïr biz (RH8,8 and RH11,10 in SammlUigKontr 2); this signifies ‘If taxes are demanded (of this land), we each determine half (‘determine what is equal’ in the second contract) and give in equal parts’. What is meant is not ‘two (halves) each’ but ‘half each’.

Ordinals from ‘3’ on have the suffix +(X)nč; e.g. törtünč ‘4th’, tokazanč ‘9th’. tümnänînč ‘1000th’ is ‘last, used for self-deprecatory purposes’ (as pointed out by S. Tezcan in a review). However, cf. törtünč with /l/ in the suffix in ThS I,1, a runiform ms., and heš yüzinč in a relatively early text, Saddh 13. +(X)nč may have been borrowed from Tokharian, where the ordinal suffix has a similar shape. bir yegirminč ‘eleventh’ appears several times in SammlUigKontr.
‘second’ is äki+nti / iki+nti; this form could be linked to the adverbal suffix +tI, found e.g. also in am+ü ‘now’ (am is attested with this meaning in South Siberian). A lone variant äkin is found in ordinal use in BQ E32; this may represent the base of äkinti if it is not an error. Adjectival ‘first’ is expressed by nominal derivates like bašla-yu+kï (expanded from the vowel converb of baš+la- ‘to begin’), baš+rün+kï ‘which is at the head’, 397 ašnu+kï (e.g. äy ašnu kiün ‘the very first day’ in MaitH XV 13v29) < ašnu ‘before, earlier’ or ilki, 398 or (as in Xw 117 or Mait 26A r11) by cardinal bir. Compound numerals involving ‘one’ can also use bir and not the other terms as ordinal: bir otuz kün tà ken (MaitH XV 13v23) is ‘after the 21st day’. 399

bašlayu itself is twice in Orkhon Turkic (KT E16 and 25 respectively) used for adverbal ‘(at) first’: kaím xaganka bašlayu ba xagonig balbal ti kmiš ‘He is said to have, for my father the emperor, at first erected Baz kagan’s memorial stone’; bašlayu kirkü xagonig balbal tikdim. ‘First I erected the Kïrkü emperor as memorial stone.’ Similarly äy baš layu tagdokda (Suv 348,6-7) ‘the very first time that he was born’. The Suv also has bašlayu+çå with the equative suffix. iki+läyü (e.g. in Suv 604,9) is ‘again’, i.e., literally, adverbal ‘for the second time’. This form must be a simulative in +lAyU, since a +lA- derivate from ‘two’ is not attested; in view of this, bašlayu might also be a simulative signifying ‘as head’, although a verb bašla- does exist. Note, though, that there also is an adverb ikilä ‘again’ (e.g. in MaitH X 1v4 and XV 12r3, Fedakâr 280 etc.). Cf., finally, ikinti+läyü in Suv 32,7, formed from the ordinal. The very common bir ikintišikä ‘one another’ (cf. sections 3.13 and 4.5) also clearly contains the word for ‘second’, but the 3rd person possessive suffix, as /s/ > /ši/ is a process well-known from a number of languages including Proto-Mongolic but not attested in Early Turkic; nor could one explain the lack of ‘pronominal’ /n/ at this stage of the language. 400 It may possibly have been adopted from the verbal cooperative-reciprocal suffix.

397 In Fedakâr 189 (Sogdian script) sIutar bitig PŠD/YK tüzünç clearly signifies ‘stūra text, first scroll’. The merely transliterated word is clearly also a derivate of baš but the editor’s transcription as baši(t)ig is not certain.

398 Formed from the base of ilgärü ‘forward’ with the suffix +kl; see section 3.126 for a discussion.

399 Cf. German einundzwanzigster ‘21st’ vs. erster ‘1st’ and similar French vingt-etu-uniéme vs. premier.

400 [bir ikintišikä in U5 (TM 342) 2r1 (SÉddTF 541; edited by Le Coq and recently reedited by Zieme) is a conjecture and even the s² is rather damaged.
For reference to individuals in a group one adds the possessive suffix to the ordinal form. To express the content ‘one of them’, e.g., we have biri in a very early source: olarka uç ötmak [berd]ım, ol biri yılan tärkin [ka]pap yedi (DreiPrinz 46) ‘I gave them (i.e. the 3 snakes) three loaves of bread. One of those snakes quickly snatched (them) and ate (them)’. In Buddhist and Qarakhanid texts the possessive suffix is twice added to the cardinal number, as birisi (e.g. in HTs VIII 29, U III 67,61, frequently in the QB); ‘the other’ is ikintisi. Thus we have e.g. bo uçgünülä birisin birisin uğğūluk idalaguluk kâzïgi kâlsär ... (TT VB 107) ‘If it is one’s turn to give up these three one by one, ...’. This instance also shows how doubling is used iconically, to symbolise the one-by-one selection. A syncopated variant birsi appears as birsi Işındä, signifying ‘one by one’, in BT VII A 234 (a tantric and therefore late text) and is also found in QB.

In DLT fol.602, birin birin mıñ bolur signifies ‘One by one becomes a thousand’; bir ‘one’ is here in the instrumental case. bir+in bir+in is used with this meaning also by Rabğüzi.

Adverbial multiplicatives are in Orkhon Turkic formed with yolë, e.g. tört yolë ‘four times’ in BQ E 30 (further examples in T.Tekin 2000: 134), uç yolë ‘thrice’ in M I 34,12 and Suv 131,16. In the Yenisey inscriptions they are formed with kata, e.g. uç kata tâğıntï (E31,4) ‘He toured (the area) thrice’; similarly E48,4 and (with the same verb) E53,2. Thus also in Uygur kaç kata ‘a number of times’ in KP 23-24, bo ämïg iki kata okïyï tâğıntïm ‘I endeavoured to recite this healant twice’ in M I 29,14, kaçay kata ‘often’ in M III 7,5, Nr. 1,IV v5. Similarly yüz mıñ kata ‘100 000 times’ in QB 3058, kaç kata ‘how many times’ twice in the DLT. yol+ï is nominal, kat-a a petrified converb. For ‘once’ one generally uses the bare stem bir, but the DLT has bir kata. In Orkhon Turkic the bare stem of any numeral can be used in this way, e.g. Elterïş xagan ... tavgaçka yetï yeğirmi sıngişdi, kitañka yetï sıngişdi, oguzka beş sıngişdi (Tuñ 49) ‘Elterïş kagan fought China 17 times, the Kitañ 7 times and the Oguz 5 times’. Cf. further iki kata tamïrïm tokïp uçïnêokyïyoy unai/en tïna turur (U III 37,35) ‘My artery beats twice (but), being unable to beat the 3rd (time), stands still’, with both multiplicative and ordinal. The ordinal can also be combined with kata, as in uçïnê kata ‘for the 3rd time’ (Suv 13,23) or ikinti kata ‘for the 2nd time’ (KöktüTurf TM 326 r2-3). birär kata and üçär kata (HTs III 820 and 825) are ‘once each’ and ‘thrice each’.

401 There is a numeral in the ms..
Collectives in +(Ag)U (dealt with in OTWF section 2.52) are also often derived from numerals; e.g. ikigü or ikägü ‘a pair’ or beš+ägü ‘a group of five’. birägü is also attested, and signifies ‘a set of one’. In the instrumental case these collectives are adverbal. They appear to have been pronominal (which they in a sense are also by content, since they stand for names of groups): They usually get the pronominal accusative suffix +nI also in relatively early texts, and in Orkhon Turkic they show pronominal n before possessive suffixes (section 3.121).

iki+z (DLT etc.) is ‘twin’; this should be another instance of the plural element +(X)z found in e.g. the possessive suffix +(X)m+Xz ‘our’ or the pronoun siz ‘you (plural)’: The very common addition of the collective suffix +AgU to numerals is also, after all, not felt to be a redundancy. Note that +AgU forms denote the whole group, whereas +(X)z derivates from numerals (others being attested in Middle Turkic) denote a single ‘twin’ etc..

The suffix +gIl forms names for geometrical figures with a certain number of sides, as törtgil ‘square’ (SuV 544,8, variant in 477,2; WP3,3 and Mi28,4 in SammlUigKontr 2). The suffix may not be applicable to all numerals, if uückil toşgil sätz kirlig alti yeğimi kirlig (MaitH XXV 4r17) refers to figures with 3, 4, 8 and 16 sides.

The postposition and adverb öni ‘separate from, separately etc.’ governs nominals in the locative or the ablative but numerals in the nominative; it then has a special meaning as in kop kamag yağukkar üč öni bölär (MaitH XV 14r17) ‘he divides all humans into three groups’ or yeti öni çaesärin bičip (MaitH Y 211) ‘dividing their bodies into seven pieces each’.

Words signifying ‘all’ are kamag / kamig / kamug (this last attested in ManTüFr 161, Saddh 37 or Ms. M 657 r1 and 3 quoted in the note to BT V 521),403 alku,404 vomkî and tolp (all three deverbal), tüzi, kop (a number of times in the different Orkhon inscriptions), barča, barî (both < bar, i.e. originally ‘as much as there is’ and ‘what there is’405) and

---

402 Both forms appear to be attested well; cf. e.g. the index to SammlUigKontr.
403 Borrowed from Iranian and a cognate of Persian hama.
404 This and kop are definitely not postpositions, as stated by Gabain 1974: 135, 142.
405 DhâSü 24 has alku barča as binome. That barča should come from *bar-ır+ča as written in Gabain 1941: 59, is, I think, unlikely for semantic reasons.
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yapa. Some of these get the collective suffix, as kamag\textsuperscript{407}, yomkï+gu, tüzï+gü (Pohti 98 and 181) and alku+gu. köp, which is rather rare in Old Turkic, and ükâš signify ‘many, much’. A number of these words and also +(A)gU forms at a quite early stage show +nI (and not +(X)g) as accusative suffix, in accordance with their pronominal content. amarï ‘a few, some’ (also ‘the others’) is documented in UW 116-117. It is used both as a noun phrase by itself (both as amarîlari, when referring to a set which is part of a larger set mentioned before, and as amarî) and adnominally as part of a noun phrase. In TT X 39 we find amarîlari (and not amari) used adnominally, in amarîlari tînlîglar ... adîn âzûna ãrdîlîr “Some creatures ... went to a different existence’.

Absolute measure words of Uygur are practically always borrowed. For length and distance we find tsun ‘an inch’, ěğ ‘a foot’ or ‘a cubit’ (both < Chinese), ěğïn apparently also ‘a foot’ (in DKPAMPb 1345 and Mait 75v8), kûkï ‘a fathom’ and berï ‘a mile’. For time we can mention kšan ‘a very short moment’ (<< Sanskrit). For weight there is 1 yastuk (the Turkic word for ‘cushion’, that being the weight’s shape; cf. Persian hâlîs, with the same two meanings. A yastuk consists of 50 sîîr or sāîr (<< Greek); 1 sîîr consists of 10 bakïr. batman (= Chinese jin) is a large unit of weight. The smallest measure of capacity is kav, 10 kav being 1 şïg (<< Chinese) and 10 şïg 1 kûrî, 10 kûrî ‘bushel’ give one şïg. şïg (<< Chinese but already borrowed by Bactrian) or tagar is a measure of capacity, for grain among other things. Hence it also became a measure of arable land, based on the amount of seed required to sow it. The tämbin is a small unit for liquid measure; 3 tämbin are 1 saba, 10 saba 1 kap (the largest measure for liquids). Cf. Yamada 1971 and Matsui 2000. Measure words in a series can, of course, be joined; e.g. keji [tör]t ěğ bir tsun (HTs III 976) ‘Its width is four feet one inch’.

As pointed out by Moriyasu in several publications, the means of payment during the reign of the West Uygur kingdom was quanpu, an official and standard bale of cloth, replaced in Yuan times by kümüš

\textsuperscript{406} Not in DTS or EDPT but used with this meaning eleven times in BT XIII 2, 5, 10, 21, 22, 27, 36, 50 and 54, sometimes in binomes with kümîg, tüzî, barça or yomkî.

\textsuperscript{407} This is not a ‘Nebenform’ of kamag, as A. v. Gabain wrote in the n. to TT IX 26, but haplographically simplified from *kamag+agu. The base is known to have been copied from Iranian; no Iranistic or Turcological justification for such a ‘Nebenform’ is known to me.
'silver' or 銀. During Yuan rule, trade was effected also by böź ‘cotton cloth’.

For dates, the twelve animal cycle of years is used from the inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire on, and till the latest texts. Months are numbered (ekinti ay etc.), but çaxšapat ay is used for the last, aram ay for the first month. Days are numbered starting from the new moon (yagi ‘new’) as, e.g. üç yagiška ‘on the 3rd day of the month’. This reckoning proves that the months were indeed moon months, as warranted also by their name (ay ‘moon’); yet not all of them can have been pure moon months, as they did not wander through the seasons (as Islamic months do). Cf. in general Bazin 1991 for Old Turkic dating.

-(X)m is used for forming ad hoc units of measure: yeti tut-um talkan (TT VII 25,10) are ‘seven handfuls of parched grain’, bir aš biš-im+i üd (HTs) is ‘the time it takes for food to get cooked’, while bir tamız-im+ča+kya (InscrOuig V 45) is ‘just as little as a drop’.

3.2. Verbs

Verbs are a class of lexemes showing categories as listed in section 3.22 below; accordingly, elements such as bar ‘there is’ and yok ‘there isn’t’ or kärgäk ‘it is necessary’ are not verbs though mostly used predicatively. The presence of verbs is not obligatory either in sentences or in subordinate clauses, if the predicate is not a content to be found in a verbal lexeme, and if no explicit verbal categories are to be expressed. If verbal categories are to be expressed although the predicate is a nominal, the language uses the verb är- ‘to be’ or some other member of the small group of copular verbs (see section 3.29).

3.21 Verb derivation

We distinguish between denominal derivation (which can also have lexemes of adjective-type content as base) and deverbal derivation; it happens only very rarely that one formative is used for both purposes. The derivation of verbs from pronouns, which exists in some Turkic languages, is not productive in Old Turkic. Verb stem formation will not be described here in any detail, as this has already been done in the OTWF (the formation of denominal verbs in part V, the formation of deverbal verbs in parts VI and VII of that work, which deals with derivation as well as with its various functions); moreover, most of word formation takes place in the lexicon and not in the grammar.
3.211. Denominal verb formation
In the denominal derivation of verbs, the most common formatives are
+\(lA\)- and \(+A\)-, which form both transitive and intransitive verbs. \(+U\)-,
\+(A)d-, \+(X)k-, \+(A)r- and \(+lAn\)-, on the other hand, only form
intransitives. Onomatopoeic and synesthetic intransitives can end in
+\(kIr\)-, \(trI\)- or \(rA\); the equally intransitive \(+sIrA\)- verbs are associated
with \(+sXz\) and denote lack or loss. \+(X)rkA- \((+kA\)- with bisyllabic bases
ending in consonants\) forms transitive verbs expressing feelings,
attitudes or opinions towards their object. The possibility that there
existed a \(\emptyset\) derivation of verbs from nouns cannot be excluded: Cf.
\(kari\)- ‘to grow old’ no doubt related to \(kari\) ‘old’.

3.212. Deverbal verb formation
Derivation of verbs from verbs usually serves the diathesis category,
reported on in the next section. Desideratives and similatives, which
describe ‘types of inaction’, can, on the other hand, be mentioned here:
Verbs formed with \(-(X)gsA\)- denote the wish to carry out the action
denoted by the base verb, while adding \(-(X)msIn\)- has the writer
describe the subject’s behaviour as mere pretense. The reader is referred
to part VI of OTWF for details. An example for the latter formation
(not mentioned in OTWF 531f.) appears in \(tälgäli topolgalî umsînmîś\)
\(ol\) (HTs VIII 372) ‘He pretended to be able to penetrate it’; it is derived
from the verb \(u\)- ‘to be able’.

3.22. Verbal categories
The Old Turkic category of voice, which describes the mutual
behaviour of the participants in the action and their task in it, has four
major and two minor members. The category is expressed by a set of
intercombinable suffixes placed after the stem but before the suffix of
negation. These suffixes also serve the derivation of verbs from verbs
(q.v. in section 3.212): Note that deverbal nominals such as
\(ävr-il-înc+sîz\), \(yar-il-încêg\), \(yölî-ş-ûr-îûg\), \(hûlgûr-t-må\) (all mentioned in
the OTWF) also contain stems formed in this way. Vying and
cooperation between two or more participants in the action is expressed
by \(-(X)s\)-, an element which usually comes last in the chain of diathesis
suffixes. Passivity is expressed by \(-(X)l\)-, \(tXl\)- or \(+tUrXl\)-. \(sXk\)- verbs
have actions taking place to the detriment of subjects, partly governing
(in the accusative case) the entity lost by them. \(tXz\)- verbs show their
subjects to be responsible for activities of which they are the
objects. Verbs formed with -(X)n-, -(X)n- or the rarer -(X)d- and -(X)k- are reflexive, anti-transitive (i.e. intransitive derived from transitive) or middle. Verbs formed with -(X)r-, -(X)r-, -(X)r-, -(X)z- or -(X)t- ((I)t- in later Old Turkic), finally, are just transitive if their bases are intransitive but causative if the bases are transitive; however, -(X)t- derivates from transitive bases tend to be reversive, i.e. to get passive meaning. See section 4.5 for more details on the use of these suffixes.

If the base is a nominal clause, the opposition between intransitive and transitive is taken care of by the auxiliaries är- ‘to be’, bol- ‘to become’ and kil- ‘to do’: bağıl bağıl kil- (Mait 78v1) ‘to wound’ is the transitive or causative counterpart of bağıl bağıl bol- (Xuast I 9) ‘to get wounded’, adak asra kil- ‘to subdue’ (Mait 5r4) of adak asra bol- ‘to be subdued’ (Suv 313,1), yok yodun kil- ‘to annihilate’ of yok yodun bol- ‘to be destroyed’.

The suffix of verbal negation is -mA-, whereas nouns can be negated through yok and +sXz; the latter denotes not only ‘lack’ but also – with adjectives – negation of the quality in question. We find -mA- in finite and non-finite verb forms but not in deverbal nouns. One exception is -gUcil, dealt with in section 3.113 as a formative for forming deverbal nominals although we (rarely) do have -mA-gUcil: Even -mA-gUlXk forms describe people by their permanent qualities.410

-mA- is generally applied in agglutinative manner, but there are quite a number of exceptions (cf. Gronbech 1955 and see Erdal 1979: 156 for historical development): The aorist and, in Orkhon Turkic, the future tense (discussed in sections 3.233 and 3.234 respectively) have irregular negative forms. The negative counterpart of -mIš- is -mAdOk, with -mA+mIš starting its appearance in not very early texts (rare even in Suv). -mA-gU is not attested in early texts either; it is rare in Suv but we do find it e.g in U III 54,13 or BT I D 273 and 320; the distribution of -mA-gUlXk appears to be similar. Uyghur -(X)p, -(X)pAn and the vowel

---

408 Gabain 1974 § 160 (and already in the note to l. 1805 of her edition of parts of HTs VII) expressed the view that the meaning of this formative is ‘intensive’, mentioning the verbs al- ‘to use up, destroy etc.’, ök- ‘to think’ and köniük- ‘to burn up’. The semantic relationship of the first with al- ‘to take’ is dubious, the second, quoted from U II 11,8, is a mistake for (y)ük- (‘hük-) ‘to heap up’ (what here appears is the lexicalised noun ükmäk ‘heap’) and the third (from M I 17,12) should be a scribal error for the very common kümür- ‘to burn (tr.)’. OTWF 524-5 argues against the existence of Old Turkic suffixes consisting of vowels bearing ‘intensive’ meaning.

409 Can in no way be related to -(X)r-, as thought by some scholars, as the suffixes differ both in their vowels and their consonants.

410 Only in the Suv text do we find -gUcil used as action noun (cf. section 3.282).
converb have -\textit{mAtI}n as their negative counterpart; this is presumably the instrumental of -\textit{mAtI}, appearing in this same use in runiform inscriptions and Qarakhanid.

If negation is topicalised, it can be moved to an auxiliary, as in \textit{täpränçiz bolium ārmáz mü} (Suv 626,18) ‘Have I not become immovable?’ instead of *bolmatüm \textit{mu}.

Verb stem compounding, well attested in some modern Turkic languages, is unknown in Old Turkic except for the use of \textit{u(-ma)}- ‘to be (un)able to’ in part of the corpus (cf. section 3.252 below).

Several classes of auxiliaries are compounded with the vowel converb and with the converbs in -(X)p and -\textit{gAll} to express such categories as ability, actionality, politeness and the question whether the action is carried out for the benefit of the subject or for some other participants in the action. These categories and the means for expressing them are discussed in section 3.25.

There are five further verbal categories, tense-aspect (for which see section 3.26), status, mood and, together with finite verb phrases and (partly) with the conditional, the subject’s person and number. Status and epistemic mood are the topic of section 3.27 while volitive mood and modality are dealt with in section 5.1; see section 3.231 for the forms of the volitional paradigm.

Most Old Turkic verb forms use pronouns for agentive person and number (at least in the first and second persons), but the constative preterite uses possessive suffixes (and apparently also the -\textit{sXk} form as mentioned in section 3.26).\footnote{In a contract published in Usp 24 there appears to be an instance of the 2nd person possessive suffix added to the form in -\textit{dêll}: \textit{bolmasa sân karug kultaçog} ‘Otherwise you will lose all’. At some stage in Middle Turkic the conditional also acquired possessive suffixes referring to agents.} The volitional paradigm amalgamates person and number with the volitional marker; -(A)\textit{Il}m, the 1st person plural hortative suffix, e.g., is opaque as to plurality. However, personal pronouns are by no means excluded from joining volitional forms: Cf. e.g. \textit{siz} ‘you (pl.)’ added to the 2nd person plural imperative of \textit{tïla} in \textit{bäri tiňla siz} (Aranemi 1a r1) ‘Listen here!’; said in politely addressing a single person.

One can also add \textit{+lAr} to the 2nd and 3rd person plurals, and \textit{+lAr} is also found optionally in the 3rd person plural of other forms (e.g. \textit{öčäšmišlär} ‘they are said to have argued’ in a runiform ms. or \textit{külmišlär}
‘they are said to have laughed’ in Yos 18). Instances like *alku tïnlïglar bo ... kišig sävär taplayur ayayur agitationlar* (TT V A 113) ‘all creatures love and honour this person’, where four verb forms share the suffix, or the sentence *yer suylar suv üzäki kemi osuglug altï törlüg tïprïyïr kamïayurlar* ‘The continents shake and rock six ways, like a ship on water’ (MaitH XX 1r2) might suggest that it comes from the plural demonstrative pronoun *olar*. This is a possibility, especially in view of the fact that *ol*, the singular counterpart of *olar*, is often used as a copula, without demonstrative content. The fact that *-lAr* is shared between more than one word does not, however, make this idea more likely, as case suffixes, for instance, can also be shared. Since the quoted forms are participles in predicative use, one might think that what we have here is the participle (which is, after all, a nominal form) in the plural. Note, however, that Uygur also has *-zUnlAr* (e.g. in M I 29,16 and 30,18) and *-dIlAr* for the 3rd person plural of the imperative and the preterite respectively (beside *-zUn* and *-dI*, which can also be used with a plural subject), although these are not nominal; these prove that /lAr/ has become a plural marker for the verb as well. Another possible explanation for these forms is that verbal *-lAr* started from the participles and reached the truly finite forms by analogy.

In none of these paradigms does Old Turkic show the distinction inclusive / unmarked, known from some modern Turkic languages.

The expression of person and number is not obligatory in early texts, e.g. with *süümäsär in ayæru süümäsär kaçanïtig ürsïr ol biçi – xagani alp ürmsï, aygucësï bïlgi ürmsï – kaçanïtig ürsïr olürtïcïk ök* (Tuñ 20-21) ‘If (we) do not fight it (i.e. the Türk confederation) it will, at some stage – its ruler is said to be valiant and his advisors are said to be clever – at some stage (it) will definitely kill us’; reference to the confederation involved has also to be supplied from the context, and the writer may have meant that reference to be understood as a plurality: I refer to ‘the Türk confederation’ only in order to adapt my translation to the Old Turkic text. Outside Orkhon Turkic, subject plurality is very often expressed explicitly even when it also follows from the context, but not where a plural subject is adjacent: Cf. *yäklär källir* ‘The demons come’ and *tammïl üzültïlįr taştkar* ‘The rejected souls come’ (M II 11,10 and 13). This holds also when the subjects are human, e.g. *bolar mini bilmäz* ‘They wouldn’t recognise me’ (TT X 473 -4), referring to Brahmans. In *kmanaş kara bodun yıgulîp bir ikintištïk ìncea tep iştïlîr* (DKPAMPb 159) ‘All the common people assembled and told each other the following’ the plurality of the subject is lexical but not morphological, while verbal plurality is expressed both by plural and by
cooperative-reciprocal morphology. The plurality expressed in *tetiglär … boşgunsarlar tiylaslar ikişin bilü umazlar* (HTs VIII 155) ‘(Even) the clever ones cannot understand most of it when they study it or listen to it’ is verbal and not nominal, as the plurality expressed is that of the verbs’ subjects; the plural verb forms do not refer to any plurality of entities as participles would.

There are no plural verb forms in runiform inscriptions, but there does not appear to be any difference between Manichaean and other Uygur texts concerning the use of +lAr with verbs. In Manichaean sources we find such examples: *barça kišlar inçe tilayurlar* ‘All people wish this’ (M III 23.30), *ärksinür elänurlar elîglär xanlar* ‘They govern and rule, the kings and rulers’ (M III Nr.8 II r 8-9); *bo savka ymâ kamgan külmislâr, yosipasingi ögmislâr, inçe temîslâr* (M III Nr.14 r 1-2) ‘They all laughed at this matter, praised Aesop and said the following’; *ol ýdka k(ama)g(ül)ýril m(ä)jigü ögrîncüldüg s(ü)vinçülb bolgaylar* (M I 11.6-8) ‘Then all the gods will forever be happy’; *k(á)ltü manä burxan amari burxanlar vrîstilâr […] bo â […] kâlsârlâr* (M I 24.7) ‘When the prophet Mani and the other prophets come (to …)’; *ölürgâli elîtsârlâr* (M III Nr.14 v 1) ‘When they lead it to death …’; *sizlar ânî üçün okîmiš boltuylâlar* (M III Nr.7 III r 5) ‘You have been called412 for that reason’; *turunçlar kamûn bâglâr kadašlar* (M II 9.4) ‘Stand up, all lords and brothers!’ The instance from M III Nr.8 quoted above as well as *ögürdi sævintilâr* in SP 39 or *içmûn yemânarlâr* in Wilkens 2000 Nr. 65 show that the juncture between verb forms and this suffix was a rather loose one, as we have pairs of verb forms (aorist, constative preterite and volitional in the mentioned instances) sharing a single plural suffix.

Grönbech 1936: 72 (quoting Buddhist examples for +lAr with the finite verb) states that such plural verb forms are used only when the subject is a living being. This appears to be generally true but there are exceptions; here is a Manichaean and a Buddhist one: *içün sigür ikişi ärûrlar külçülglär kömülär*413 biliglar saînçlar kim içâyârâlar kamshâyârâlar; *ançula mânzîlg ärûrlar kalt ulug taloy samudrâ* (M III Nr.4 r 14) ‘Inside there are numerous forceful ones, attitudes, impressions and thoughts which are bubbling and stirring; they look like the great ocean’.

---

412 *okî-t-mîş* refers to the object of the verb, as -(X)t- derivates from transitive verbs often do.
413 This is not an error, as double /l/ is often simplified.
3.23. Finite verb forms

The Old Turkic finite verb differs from infinite verb forms in that it normally expresses the person and the number of its subject(s), in that its typical task is to serve as a sentence predicate; it cannot, on the other hand, be used adnominally or adverbially. The person–number category has six members, three in the singular and three in the plural. The category can be said to be optional with finite verb forms as well, since a verb form in the 3rd person may in fact not be coupled with any reference to a subject; the content then corresponds to English ‘one’ as subject. The verb is in the plural also if there is only a single subject in the nominative, in case there is another one in the instrumental case form; e.g. xaganımın sii eldümiz (Tuñ 53) ‘I went on campaigning together with my khan’; There is a similar rule also in some other languages such as Turkish and Russian. Old Turkic has no distinction between an inclusive and a neutral 1st person plural (i.e. sensitivity to whether any third party is included in the reference to the 1st person plural beside the speaker and the addressee) which we find in some Turkic languages.

In Orkhon Turkic only the verb forms of the volitional paradigm have a true person-number conjugation; the mood suffixes are amalgamated with person and number and do not fall into one morphological slot together with the indicative tense-aspect or the participle and converb suffixes. Still, the early Turks did not conceive of indicative verbal content only in nominal terms: There is nothing nominal about the purely predicative future in -gAy as documented in the sources, and indirective -mlş cannot (or no longer can) be equated with the verbal noun of the same shape. Imperfective aspect, the one dominating the present-tense domain, is exclusively participial; thus especially the aorist. Note that the participles in -(X)gmA and -(X)glI (and -gAn, wherever it appears) are never found in fully predicative use; nevertheless the participial and the finite uses of the -Ur form cannot be considered to be mere homonyms, as they are too similar in content. The Orkhon Turkic -dʌɮ future also originates in a present participle attested as such in Uygur and living on in Western Turkic; in Orkhon Turkic it moved into the future tense (in fact only into the positive

---

414 Prehistorically, -gAy may have contained the suffix -gA forming deverbal nouns; see sections 3.112 and 3.234. Besides, -gAy is not attested in Orkhon Turkic; that may nevertheless be said to be largely nominal in the functioning of its indicative verbal system, as Classical Mongolian was.
future, as the negative future form is different) as a result of ‘present-renewal’.

The forms of the constative preterite -d+, the only indicative verb forms to express person by morphological means, use the possessive personal suffixes to refer to the subject. This can be explained as originally expressing the ‘possession of an act’; the paradigm may have survived from an older system in which verbal morphology only characterised aspect, the use of the possessive paradigm serving as a converter for anteriority (as in Yakut; Republican Turkish (y)İlm etc. is also a tense converter). In section 3.232 we quote a Mait instance where the form is governed by a postposition, i.e. in fact appears in nominal use. The Orkhon inscriptions also have the -sXk form with the possessive suffix +X referring to the addressee as subject. It expresses the speaker’s opinion that a certain event will needs follow automatically from deeds being carried out by the addressee; the message that there will be no escape from the results may have been behind a use of a suffix implying perfective aspect.

Verbal nominals used as perfect or projection participles also use possessive endings to refer to the subject, while person is expressed by pronouns with all other predicative verb forms (including the future form in -gAy, which is not a participle). Converbs are not followed by personal suffixes, but converbal phrases consisting of participles governed by postpositions sometimes are. All verb forms used as predicates of main clauses, and the conditional form -sAr, can in Uygur get the suffix +lAr to show that the subject is in the plural, e.g. in the analytical phrase kucmaz-lar mu ārdi ‘weren’t they wont to embrace?’ (DKPAMPb 608). Sentences such as män öyür män (Aran 1 a 2) ‘I remember’ or bän anča ter män ‘I say as follows’ already in Tuñ 37 show that previous mention of the subject did not cause its deletion in the verb phrase. In 3rd persons we often find the pronoun ol, even when there is an explicit subject. The fact that, in the Tuñ example quoted, the independent pronoun is bän but the clitic one män and that the 3rd person plural adds +lAr directly to the verb form speaks for referring to forms with the clitic paradigm as finite as well. To this we can add the clitic miz, which is added in Qarakhanid Turkic to verb forms instead of biz: biz barmas miz (DLT fol.301); kilur miz (QB 4904), ursa miz (QB 4016). The explanation for this is not, of course, phonetic but analogy from män.

Reference to the subject could usually be gathered from the context when the sentence itself did not supply it; if this was not the case either,
the sentence was understood to hold for any subject, what is sometimes called ‘impersonal’.

3.231. The volitional paradigm
This was the only paradigm clearly finite already in Proto-Turkic: The other predicative forms including the preterite (discussed in the next section) appear to have been built around participles. Here are the volitional\(^{415}\) forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) person</td>
<td>-(A)yIn</td>
<td>-(A)Ilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) person</td>
<td>Ø, -(X)Iη</td>
<td>-(X)η, -(X)ηlAr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) person</td>
<td>-zUn</td>
<td>-zUn, -zUnlAr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: taš ïk, yorï-yïn, yaz-ma-yïn; buz-ma artat-ma ... æc togil\(^{416}\) (MaitH XV 13v11-13), tur-ma (DKPAMPb 889); sîn-alîm ‘let us test’ (Wettkampf 42), kaviš-alîm; tašik-iţi, äšid-iţiîär (MaitH XXV 3r17) ‘listen (pl.)’’. The 1\(^{st}\) person singular suffix is often spelled as -(A)yIn in Manichaean and other texts, but Zieme (note to BT V 362) doubts that this has any phonetic significance. Variants of the shapes -AyI and -Ay are used in the QB when needed for the sake of rhyme or metre; see Hacemiñoğlu 1996: 190 for examples of -AyI.\(^{417}\)

The 3\(^{rd}\) person imperative has several variants. In a runiform letter ms. (UigBrieffR B v) we find the form berzün spelled with a diacritical mark over the Z, suggesting a pronunciation -zUn. Since such diacritics are known only in the runiform mss., this indication at pronouncing the sibilant may actually be old. It accords with the form bol-çun which we find in Orkhon Turkic, in KT E 11 and BQ E10, appearing in opposition to bolmaζun: [z] is the voiced counterpart of [ç], and ð/ð\(^{2}\) are in Orkhon Turkic replaced at the beginning of several suffixes by t/\(t^{2}\), their voiceless counterparts, when the stem ends in /r l/. The grapheme choice between T and D has been taken to reflect an opposition between a voiced stop and a voiced fricative (see section 2.409); however, such a distinction could not lie behind the alternation ĉ : ẑ if the diacritic which we find here is taken at face value.

---

\(^{415}\) I use this term instead of the more usual ‘imperative’ because the 1\(^{st}\) person forms cannot be said to give orders. The other persons are also used for a much wider array of interactional contents than the use of the term ‘imperative’ would suggest.

\(^{416}\) gIl is a particle discussed in section 3.344.

\(^{417}\) Hacemiñoğlu is misleading concerning -Ay; it occurs in QB 560 (B against AC), 1033 (BC), 3186 (C against B) and 4172 (BC against A) and thus does seem to be real.
In Qarakhanid sources, the 3rd person imperative always has /s/ instead of /z/, and around half of the Brāhmī instances are not -zUn but -sUn. Cf. also mini atayu yarlıkasunlar (M I 30,18) ‘May they graciously evoke my name’ in a late addition to a Manichaean ms.. In the fragments in Sogdian script (Fedakâr) we find a suffix variant -zUnI in artamazunî (205), tavranzunî (350) and bolzunî (392), all in fragmentary context. This variant is well attested in the QB as -sUnI where demands by rhyme or metre. The QB also has many examples of a variant -sU, which one might want to link with the form -zU in tängri yarlıkazu found in Tuñ 53 and KT E29. QB examples for -sU and -sUnI are listed in Hacımenoğlu 1996: 192. It is unclear, however, whether the suffix appearing in these inscriptive passages is a variant of -zUn: The KT passage has a parallel in the BQ inscription, which has yarlıkadok ücüm instead of yarlıkazu. An imperative would, indeed, not be appropriate in the Tuñ or the KT contexts, as both refer to the past. This makes it likely that -zU is an otherwise unattested archaic suffix with converb function. Finally, two parallel instances of a variant -zUnIn in a Manichaean passage: yarok tängilikayrlikazunün yavašım birlâ yaksišan adrilimal àkîlîsî prîstîlîr âkîc berzûnîn419 közi karam birlâ [kîr]uşîp[ân] külišügin oloralîm ‘May the bright gods permit it and let my gentle one and me be united never to get separated (again); may the powerful angels give us strength and may my black-eyed one meet and sit together laughing.’ (M II 8,16-9,18). I take the forms to represent a blend between the imperative suffix and an instrumental form like anîn ‘thereby’; the same process can be observed with the form -(X)pAnIn. What lies behind this is a blend between two constructions: The realisation of the wish expressed by the imperative will make the union possible; in Turkish this could also be expressed by two volitional forms, in a sentence such as Tannî izin versin de artîk ayrilmayalım. The resultative content of da in the Turkish sentence (corresponding to Arabic fa) would have been expressed by this addition of an instrumental suffix to imperatives, a wish expressing a condition.

I have spelled the 1st person plural (hortative) suffix as -(A)Im with I and not X in the second syllable as I do not recall ever having seen it with a rounded vowel; the shape of the suffix in unit-alam (M I 11,19)

418 Another feature shared by the Sogdian script mss. and the QB (as well as Early Ottoman) are the fused inability forms of the form al-u-ma-di ‘he was unable to take’.

419 Transcribed as birüg by Le Coq, who adds: ‘Lies birüng?’. I have accepted the reading proposed by Zieme 1969:119, which the facs. shows to be at least possible. Arat, who reedited the poem as ETŞ 4, literally writes yarlıkazün (thus!) and birüz.
seems to be quite rare. However, I am unable to adduce instances where it is added to verb stems ending in rounded vowels (of which there are more than thirty). -(A)lIm is the only hortative form attested in Old Turkic, but the Middle Turkic Qisäs ‘l-Anbiyā has -(A)li and -(A)līγ (for exclusive vs. inclusive or dual vs. plural meaning repectively). In view of modern evidence for these forms, it seems possible for -(A)lIm to have been secondary and Proto-Turkic to have had *(A)lI.\footnote{In QB 4975 ms. B has kirülîg against kirülîm of AC, in 5964 baralîg in A against baralîm in BC, both in dual and not plural use. Cf. also Ata 2002: 79-80 for Harezm Turkic usage.}

In some texts, -(X)γ is exclusively used for polite address to the singular, -(X)γlAr for plural addressees, e.g. bariγlar ... tilaγlär istaγlär ‘go ... search’ used by Herodes to address the three Magi in U I 5-6, or uruγlar used in answer to uraγlim in BT I B 11; in others, -(X)γ is also used for addressing more than one person. The Orkhon inscriptions have neither -(X)γlAr nor -zUmγlAr but use -(X)γ and -zUm for the plural as well. DLT fol.289 quotes a verse with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural imperative forms koymaγiz and kiγmaγiz corresponding to what would in his language be kodmaγlar and kiγmaγlar, saying that this is how the Oguz and the Kıpçak tribes form this imperative. The forms, in use in Oguz languages to this day, are constructed in analogy with the plural of personal pronouns and possessive suffixes, whereas the +lAr of other Turkic languages comes from nominal inflexion.

In M I 9,11-14 (cf. also Zieme 1969: 152) we find a cursing suffix: bir äkiγntikä karganurlar alkanurlar takä ... okišurlar “yok yodun boluγur ... otkä örtänkä tøpøn tüsüŋür ...” tep sëgüsürleγ “They curse each other and shout at each other, abusing each other by saying ‘Get destroyed! Fall into fire and flames with your head downwards!’”. I found such a suffix to be still in use as -gUr in Uzbek, Bashkir and Khalaj, where it can be added to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular; in our examples, -gUr appears to have been contracted with the plural imperative suffix -(X)γ to give -(X)γUr, similar to the contraction of the dative suffix with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person possessive endings.

The use of all these forms is discussed in section 5.1 of this work; the suffix -zUm appears also in final clauses (section 4.636).

3.232. Forms expressing anteriority

There are three verb forms referring to anteriority: The constative preterite, the inferential preterite and (in Buddhist Uygur sources) the vivid past.

\footnote{In QB 4975 ms. B has kirülîg against kirülîm of AC, in 5964 baralîg in A against baralîm in BC, both in dual and not plural use. Cf. also Ata 2002: 79-80 for Harezm Turkic usage.}
CHAPTER THREE

The constative preterite:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-dXm</td>
<td>-dXmXz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-dXg</td>
<td>-dXgXz, -dXgXz, -dXgXzlAr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-dI</td>
<td>-dl(lAr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paradigm can be described as -d (our sources with certain bases in fact spell the suffix with T, a fact to which we come back below) followed by the 'possessive' suffixes (here described in section 3.122). These suffixes commonly refer to the verb's subject when affixed to perfect or projection participles such as the ones in -mIš, -dOk and -sXk (cf. sections 3.283 and 3.284). This has given scholars since Bang 1923: 129 the idea that the alveolar part of the constative preterite suffix might originally have been that of a verbal noun; cf. also the apparently finite (and at any rate predicative) -sXk+Xŋ form quoted below from the Orkhon inscriptions. However, while there is a deverbal noun form in -(U)t (discussed in OTWF section 3.108) there is none with a /d/. Still, in MaitH XI 15r4 we find\textsuperscript{421} the phrase savlarag by the editors translated as ‘Weil wir die Worte ... erhellten (Hend.)(?’)”. Here, two -d+XmXz forms are governed by a postposition and must therefore be nominal (as yarot-dok-umuz would be). While, therefore, there appears not to have been any derivate with a /dl/, there may have been a participle with this consonant in inflectional morphology, if this single example (giving us two forms) is not an error; see also OTWF 316.

Orkhon Turkic spells the suffix with -t/τ\textsuperscript{2} when the stem ends in /n r/ (with the exception of bar-, which came from *barî- as shown by its aorist form), and with -d otherwise: See examples in Tekin 1968: 189-190. Later texts do not always keep this rule; cf. twice turdi (i.e. [turî]) in IrqB XV, a runiform manuscript. Johanson 1979 has made likely that this spelling reflects the fact that the consonant was a (voiced or lenis)

\textsuperscript{421} Gabain 1974 § 106 assumes such a suffix, for which she gives three examples: yîd ‘smell’ which she links with yîpar ‘perfume’, tod ‘full’ which she relates to toî ‘to fill (intr.)’ and kid ‘behind’, which is supposed to be related to kin with the same meaning. The first is impossible because there is no suffix ‘-par’, the second because there is no such adjective as tod ‘full’ but only a verb stem of this shape and the third because there is ke-udin ‘behind’ (formed with a suffix dealt with above, from *ke) but no ‘ked / kid’. The note to HtsBriefe 1857 has some further ‘instances’, for which see OTWF note 351 (and Röhborn’s note to HTs VIII 939 for kîzûd).

\textsuperscript{422} Cf. the facsimile; the passage is missing in the parallel Sängim ms.
stop after /l n r/ and a (voiced or lenis) fricative in all other cases; see section 2.409.

The 2nd person variants with /g/ are found especially in the Orkhon inscriptions, e.g. öl-tüg ‘you died’ in KT S6. In the 2nd person plural Orkhon Turkic may have had only -dXgXz, with forms such as bardığız and ärtigız in the KT inscription.423 While the ending -dl is found to be used from the earliest texts on also with plural subjects, we find -dllAr at least with human plural subjects, in not very late texts such as HTs, e.g. VIII 56-73, where three teachers, alternatively referred to as učagū, as bo ačarılar or as [bo] uč ačarılar, are associated with actions referred to as tutmış ärdilâr, käd boltılâr, yörûg kîltîlar and yaddîlar. The 2nd person plural can also add +lAr, e.g. in kūzādmâdişîzîr (MaitH XXI p.33 rô). -mAdXqXz itself is used for the polite singular as well; this explains why there is no +lAr variant in the 1st person plural.

Verb forms expressing perfect and/or indirective content show the suffix -mlû; in the Orkhon inscriptions, this suffix is always spelled with s', which makes T.Tekin 1968 believe that it was pronounced with /s/ by the speakers of those texts. This might be a merely graphic matter, as there is no indication in modern or Middle Turkic languages for such a variant; see section 2.35 above for some remarks concerning the sibilants in the runiform script. This is also the impression we get from the instances of -mls which we find in the Manichæan corpus: Two, in M I 6,6-8 and 7,14, appear in a text which does not at all use the Manichæan letter Š (which bears no similarity to the letter S, unlike the similarity between S and Š in normal Uygur writing) thus making no distinction between /s/ and /š/ in numerous words. The same is true for M III 6 II and III where, beside a number of instances of -mls, we also find a number of other cases of /š/ written as S. Indirectivity is dealt with in section 3.27.

-mlû and -dOk are suppletive as to negation: The negative counterpart of -mlû is -mAdOk also when used for expressing inferential anteriority; e.g. amru bušanu saknu olormüš, kağı xan öği katun ... oglüya nâcâ ayîsan nây kîginê bermâdôk ‘He is said to have sat there, worrying all

423 See section 3.122 for variation in the 2nd person plural possessive suffix in general. In Uygur and Qarakhanid there is the phenomenon that /n'/ is sometimes spelled with K and not NK; this is merely a matter of spelling, however, as the front K is used in words with back vowels as well. bardığız is quoted in Doerfer 1993:1 from Ögin (R4) as a feature distinguishing the dialect of that inscription from that of KT, but the last syllable may (according to the Thomsen – Wulff material) not be visible; i.e. this may be a singular form.
the time. However often his parents asked him, he never gave an answer’ (ChristManMsFr Man v11); the fused sequence -mlš+kA is, however, negated as -mAyOk+kA. -mAmlš first turns up in the latest Old Turkic sources. The suffix -dOk apparently had a low vowel, to judge by the form ārtmādök attested in TT VIII G 50 in fragmentary context. On the other hand, however, we find bar-ma-duk+ug in TT VIII A 1. There is no real evidence in Old Turkic for positive -dOk used otherwise than as a verbal nominal or in participial function, although Kašgari fol.298-299 does supply us with such evidence from the dialects of “most of the Oguz and some of the Suvars and Kipchak” (quoted in Tekin 1997: 7). Tekin 1997: 6 quotes “ābkā tāgdöküm ‘I arrived in the camp’ from Ongin R 2 but what can be seen there (and could be seen when the inscription was discovered) is only tāgd[ök]jīm. He also states that Volga Bolgarian and Danube Bolgarian had finite (positive) -dOk, but that is disproven in Erdal 1993: 76-80 and 1988 respectively. Since there is nothing else, we have to state that Old Turkic has -dOk as finite verb only if negated, although that may have been different in Proto-Turkic.

The suffix -yOk expressing the vivid past presumably had a low vowel and not /U/, because it is spelled thus in TT VIII H 50 and L 18 and 21; cf. however bulganyū[k] in TT VIII O 9. In this function it appears only in Buddhist texts; in the 3rd person this always gets the pronoun ol added to it. There are no runiform examples of -yOk; in Manichaean sources it is attested only as participle (section 3.283) and only in six instances (most of them in the late Pothi book). Its function is discussed in section 3.26; D.M. Nasilov (1966) has dealt with this suffix, giving numerous Uygur examples and discussing its survival in modern languages in Siberia; N. Demir recently showed that it survives also in southern Anatolian dialects.

3.233. The aorist

The so-called aorist,424 whose form is used also as participle (section 3.282), usually expresses continuous aspect. The suffix of the positive aorist has the allomorph -yUr with stems ending in vowels;425 -r is also found with these stems, though less often than -yUr in Old Turkic proper. -yUr is not necessarily the older form (a view expressed by Johanson 1976: 143-4 and Doerfer 1993: 30), although it did not

---

424 I use this traditional term because the many variants of the form, -Ar, -Ir, -Ur, -yUr and -r, make it inconvenient to refer to this morpheme in archphonemic manner.
425 We find ogša-yūr in Windg (l.50 of the Zieme edition).
survive very well into Middle and Modern Turkic; it could quite well be the newer one: -r is more often found in the early attestation of common forms such as te-r ‘says’ (the only form in Orkhon Turkic, with 9 instances in Tuñ, 3 in KT, 3 in the Ongin inscription; very common in the IrqB, TT I 44, Mait 51 v10, 4 times in TT VIII E etc.) or yarlıka-r ‘orders; deigns to’ (M III 35,14, TT X 99, more than 30 times in Mait etc.), tokî-r ‘hits’ (Mait 110 r10 and 15), oyna-r ‘plays, dances’ (Mait 140 r5), yorî-r ‘walks’ (Mait 89 r17, 173 r7 and 25), ogša-r (HTs III 212) and so forth. The Brahmi texts of TT VIII alone have telâ-r, arî-r, kurî-r, kogša-r, savikla-r, akla-r, titrâ-r, udikla-r and yarsî-r. The probable direct connection between -mAz (discussed below) and -r also speaks for the greater antiquity of -r. -yUr might possibly be the result of syncopation from -yU är; see section 3.251 for the joining of vowel conjugates with ār- to express durativity.

After consonants the aorist suffix has the alternants -Ur, -Ir and -Ar, which alternate according to whether the stem is simple or derived and, if the latter, with what formative (cf. also section 2.51 above on this):

Most simple stems (both one- and two-syllable ones) have -Ar but a few have -Ur and some other few (like tâg-) have -Ir. Intransitive derived stems such as the ones formed with -(X)k-, +(X)k-, (onomatopoeic) +kIr- etc. have -Ar while passive, reflexive and cooperative-reciprocal stems and stems with the causative suffixes other than -(X)t- have -Ur. Stems derived with -(X)t- have -Ir in early texts; in later texts this formative becomes -(I)t- while its aorist and aorist vowel changes to /Ul/. ögîr- ‘to rejoice’ has /Al/ as aorist and aorist suffix in Manichaean texts (most of which are older) but usually /Ul/ in others: The change may have come about in analogy to its synonym sâvin-, with which ögîr- is often used in a biverb; such analogy often happened in biverbs. The topic of Old Turkic aorist and aorist vowels is discussed in detail in Erdal 1979b; cf. also Erdal 1986.

The negative aorist suffix is -mA which is, like its positive counterpart, followed by pronouns referring to the subject. One might analyse this as -mA-z, taking -z to be another allomorph of -yUr etc.; this seems to be a viable idea, since the conditioning between the other allomorphs is not purely phonological either, but is also based on the morphological profile of the base. One could even make a genetic connection between -r and -z, since an alternation /Ir/ ~ /Ir/ appears also in other domains of the grammar (discussed above in section 2.36). In modern Turkic languages one would prefer not to connect the two

---

426 The form by Tekin 1968 read as ‘yasə-r’ in KT N10 is quite certain to be conditional ay-sar ‘since he decrees’.
suffixes, since -mAz is stressed whereas other forms negated with -mA- place stress on the syllable preceding this suffix; but we know nothing certain about stress in Old Turkic, and stress may have moved forward secondarily (e.g. in analogy to other verb forms, which stress the last syllable).

In Qarakhanid Turkic, -mAz appears as -mAs, though /z/ is not otherwise devoiced in coda position in that dialect. -mAs may have been a dialect variant: We have e.g. yanmas yer 'the place of no return' in M III nr.16 v 3. There, this is clearly not an instance of the confusion of s and z, at any rate, as M III nr.16 is an archaic text showing no instances of voice confusion.\footnote{An error cannot be excluded; the ms. is (according to Peter Zieme) now lost.}

\`-mA-yUr’ does not exist: Zieme 1991: 415 (footn.113) explains the two instances where this was thought to appear as the positive aorists t"um"a-y"ur ‘adorns’ and tarma-y"ur ‘scratches’ respectively.\footnote{Doerfer 1993: 51. 47 still quotes the first form from ET§ 12 as ‘taymayar’ and the second form from M III Nr.11v3 as ‘yadmayar’. The first instance is the only evidence which he gives for his statement ‘Negative Konjugation sehr zers"ort’.}

3.234. Future\footnote{I use this term to cover absolute or relative future meaning, or future tense and future taxis.} verb forms

The suffix -gAy is used for reference to the future in the whole of Uygur but not in the Orkhon inscriptions or in most inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire. It is, however, attested also in the Qara Balgasun inscription, the latest inscription of the Uygur steppe empire, and in some South Siberian runiform inscriptions, and found in runiform mss., e.g. ol tašıg özı iızı tutsar kopka utgay ‘If one keeps that stone on oneself one will prevail over everything’ (Blatt 18). In Erdal 1979: 89 (footn.) I supported the hypothesis (put forward by Gabain 1959: 39) that -gAy should be related to -gA (discussed in section 3.113 above as a deverbal nominal suffix): The forms alternate for metrical purposes in the QB\footnote{E.g. bolu bergä ödläg kälä bergä kat (6095) ‘Fate will support him and blessing will come upon him’.} and the Ottoman future and modal suffix -A must come from

\footnote{Benzing 1952 is of the opinion that -r, -z and -s are of different origins: He approvingly quotes Bang’s view connecting -z with the deverbal nominals in -(X)z (dealt with in OTWF § 3.111) and would like to link -s to the -sXk suffix forming necessitative participles. While the possibility that -mAz should come from -(X)z cannot be wholly excluded, the latter proposal seems unacceptable to me, as there is no ‘+Xk’ suffix in sight. Benzing wanted to link the latter parts of -sXk and -dOk to the particle (O)k and to +R (dealt with in OTWF § 2.11) but that is excluded because of the vowels. Benzing 1980 then proposes reading -sXk as -(A)sXk.}
-gA, which is retained in inflection in Khorasani Turkic. -gA may, I believe, have been an original participle suffix: The final /y/ of -gAy might have been the nominative form of the archaic demonstrative pronoun *i / ì (found e.g. in inça and intin; see the end of section 3.132 above), postposed for subject reference. This hypothesis would also explain why -gAy is only used predicatively and not as a participle: 431 -gA í / ì would be syntactically equivalent to a sequence like -mış ol, which also consists of a participle followed by a demonstrative and is also, as a verb phrase, limited to predicative use; the original 3rd person would have gotten generalised to other persons once (with the disappearance of *î) -gAy got opaque. In Old Turkic, -gA is found practically exclusively as formative of deverbal nouns but appears with the same function as -gAy in KP 75,2 and 76,6 (in a part of the text which shows signs of lateness).

The runiform inscriptions have no -gAy but -däčl instead, e.g. in tedäči, kallači, öltüräči, kältäči and äräči, with -mäčl as negated counterpart; e.g. ölmäči yetmcäi sän ‘You will not die or perish’ (SU E5) or bo yolun yorüšar yaramäči ‘If (we) go this way it will do no good’ (Tuğ 23). 432 -mäčl appears to have corresponded to -čl, another (quite rare) future participle suffix: There are a few instances of the positive counterpart of -mäčl as participle qualifying nouns which refer to pregnant living beings: Such are buzagulači kottuz ingäk (PañcÖlm 8) ‘a yak cow about to give birth’ and kulnači kisrak (DLT) ‘a pregnant mare’; a further example of kulnači is found in Windg 13 (reedition by Zieme in BT XIX Anhang), of buzagulači in IqB XLI. 433 Predicative -däčl forms with future reference are found also in Qarakhanid, e.g. bodun agår ayäči ‘The people will say to him …’ in the DLT and mini yettäči ‘He will lead me’ in the QB. ikimjav (< kimkä näy) bermäči mânr ‘I will not give it to anybody’ appears in DreiPrinz 86, an early Manichæan source; the context is fairly clear. Since this text has the form bergäy two lines further on, its language may have shown a suppletive relationship between -gAy and -mäčl.

431 Cf. however tašgaru ungäy tâg mânr (MaitH XIII 4v7) ‘it looks as if I will go out’.

432 Tekin 1968: 73 thought that -mäčl was contracted from -mA-ga<čl. This is unlikely because no such contractions took place at this early stage, although AgU > A may have occurred in nälak ‘to what purpose’ (DLT fol. 197 and elsewhere; possibly < nægüvlük) and in two other very late lexemes. Moreover, the deverbal noun in -gA (never negated in Old Turkic) is always agentive and would not have needed the suffix <čl to make it so.

433 Another possibility is that -mäčl is a contraction from *-mAdčl < *-mAAdčl, the second vowel then getting syncopated through the movement of the accent to the syllable before -mA-.
Occasionally -gAy is used with imperative meaning, as future forms sometimes will; see section 5.1 below for an example. I have not met instances of this form having optative meaning, as happens e.g. in Karaim; Gabain states this to be the case but gives no examples. yaragay ‘It will do’ is in KP 48.6 used to show the speaker’s agreement to a request, as ‘All right!’ or ‘O.K.!’; this idiomatic use can have come from future meaning as well and need not point at an early specifically modal meaning for -gAy. The elliptic modal use of bolgay ‘it will become’ is also discussed in section 5.1.

In Orkhon Turkic there may be traces of another future verb form referring to subjects with possessive suffix and used as main verb of sentences; it only appears twice in one passage in the KT inscription, repeated practically unchanged in the BQ inscription: üküš türk bodun öltüg; türk bodun ölsüküg, beriyä čugay yĩş tũg hũ tũ (ũ)nũ yazĩ konayĩn tesär türk bodun ölsüküg (KT S 6-7 and BQ N 5) ‘You Turk people were killed in great numbers. O Turk people, you might die! If you intend to settle the Shi-hui mountain forest and the T. plain, o Turk people, you might die.’ The translation of -sXX+Xŋ (once with the oral alternant of the 2nd person singular possessive suffix) as epistemic modal form is conjectural: -sXk otherwise forms necessitative participles. A possible nominal rendering would be ‘(It means) your inevitable death’.

The imminent future form in -gAllr (see section 3.26 for finite, section 3.285 for infinite use) does not seem to have turned up in inscriptional or in Manichæan sources, speaking for relatively late appearance. It might come from *-gAll ärür, the aorist of the very rare analytical phrase in -gAll är- (section 3.251). Instances in ZiemeTexterg (Manichæan script) and QB (Arabic script) show that the suffix had /g/ and not /k/. Gabain 1974 § 259 with n.41 and Tezcan (BT III 77 with n.) spell it with /k/ because they think it resulted from a contraction with the verb forms kal-ir and käl-ir. This is, I think, less likely than my hypothesis; cf. the criticism expressed by Arat in ETŞ n. 35110 (p. 433).

3.24. The analytical verb

A verb phrase can, beside a fully lexical verbal kernel, include another verb, which can be grammatical to varying degrees. See section 4.23 for complex verb phrases in which none of the verbs is purely grammatical; the ‘other verbs’ in the sections of 3.25 can have partly grammatical,
partly lexical meaning. When only one of the verbs in a verb phrase is lexical to any degree, the construction is called ‘analytical’; e.g. ögdün sözlädi ärđi (Abhi B 82b4) ‘He had said before ...’. There are even triple sequences such as kälmiş ärđi ārsär (HtsTug V 79,25) ‘even though ... had come’ or köz ārklig yinčürdčiči istăđčiči ārmäz ārip (Abhi B 56a10) ‘the sense of sight not being an analysing or searching one’.

The second (and third, if any) verbal component of an analytical verb phrase is grammatical: Such complex verb phrases are necessary for expressing categories such as tense, taxis, actionality, intention, ability, version, status, epistemic and deontic mood or for undergoing subordination in conditional or converb clauses. These contents are discussed in the following sections.

Analytical verb phrases expressing actionality, intention, ability or version (discussed in section 3.25) use a variety of verbs, but other categories are formed by having forms of lexical verbs get followed by forms of ār- ‘to be’. bol- ‘to become’ also appears to express aspect, not actionality, only when added to perfect participles in -mIš; (see section 3.26). The lexical element always precedes the grammatical element, although scrambling is otherwise common in all texts. Another optional (possibly clitic) final member of a verb phrase is a subject pronoun.434 Such sequences can be broken apart only by the particles Ok (e.g. ozmîš ok ārür; bermäz ok ārsär) and mU. The particle idi, which precedes negative words to stress their negativity, can also be part of the verb phrase. When the lexical part of these phrases is one of the forms used as main predicates of sentences, either of the participle type (-mIš, -yOk etc.) or such that are used only predicatively (-dî, -gAy), the results generally come to be members of the tense-aspect system discussed in section 3.26. When converbs are used as first elements in analytical constructions, the products always express actionality, intention, ability or version.

Forms of ār- which appear as non-first element in analytical sequences are the preterite, ārür and ārgäy to serve the expression of tense and taxis (see section 3.26), ārmîš for the status category (section 3.27), ārdöök with possessive suffix to make object clauses, ārip / ārmätin to turn sentences into adjuncts und ārsär to incorporate them into conditional sentences or correlative relativization (as in kanyî kišî kim bo yarokun ārmä[ig] k(ā)jîntî köçülîn ičrâ tarîmiš ārsär, ol kišî b(ä)ilgusî antag ārür: (M III nr. 8 VII r2-4) ‘Any person who has

434 bün appears as män in this position (though not as independent pronoun) already in some runiform inscriptions, showing that the pronoun was indeed part of the verb phrase already at that stage.
planted inside his own heart this existence with light, that person’s mark is as follows’). If ärmiş, ärdökin, ärip, ärmätin and ärsär were to be replaced by -mIš, -dOk+, -(X)p, -mAAtIn and -sAr forms of the lexical verbs, these verb phrases would lose the possibility to express aspect.

When a verb phrase consists of two verbs, categories can be distributed among them in various ways. With the pluperfect consisting of two -d+ forms, the first is the one inflected for ‘person’; this is what we have in the first part of the following sentence: kayu üdün män beš törlüg ulug tülüg kärdüm ärti, antada bärü ... olorgalt küsäy ärtim (MaitH XI 4v18) ‘When I had seen the five sorts of great dreams, from that time on was I wishing to sit ...’. In the second analytical phrase of the quoted sentence, it is the preterite form which is marked for person, as that is morphological and does not demand a pronoun. The ‘number’ category can have it both ways: In yäk iğäkig kertgümänä ärtilär (TT VI 131) ‘They were not wont to believe in demons’ and in several additional sentences following this one or in ötgürmiš topolmiš ärdilär (HTs VIII 55) quoted above it is the auxiliary which has the plural suffix. In çänkramit kilu xorilhar ärti (MaitH Y 225) ‘They were walking about as a spiritual exercise’ or in tägrä tolı tururlar ärti (KP 71,4), however, the lexical verb has the plural. ädgü öflislíärt appears in U IV D 10, e.g., tavišganka kälyök ärdilär three lines further on, in U IV D 13: In most of the sentences quoted, the subject is explicitly referred to only in a preceding sentence. In kertgümän kögülüg upasi upasanlar bar ärtilär (TT VI 130) ‘There were truly faithful male and female community members’ plurality is also expressed by the finite word. The TT VI 131 example just quoted is an example of ‘negation’ getting expressed by the lexical, the first element. Another distribution of negation would, in principle, also be possible, as with the politeness auxiliary tägin- in yazokka tüsä tägin-mä-gäy ärtimiz (KP 8,1) ‘We would not venture to fall to sin’.

3.25. Types of action

The verbal categories for which complex verb phrases are formed can express tense or taxis, mentioned in the previous section, which localize the stretch of time during which the event took place with respect to the

---

435 Lacunas of the passage are here not marked as such as it is attested also in the parallel Sängim ms. (BT IX p.106).

436 Thus following UW 404a.

437 ärti can serve as the past tense of bar ‘there is’; here, however, the two are combined.
moment of speaking or to other events. Other complex verb phrases – discussed here – serve the categories of actionality, intention, ability or version, which refer to factual features of the event. Actionality describes the **course** and **development** of the event in time and specifies the **stage** of this development in which the point referred to is situated, as actually perceived by the speaker. It contrasts with aspect, expressed not by auxiliaries but by the morphological verb forms, which is about the **presentation** of the event’s course, taken by itself, as adapted by the speaker to the needs of his context (and not related to his perception). Another three ‘types of action’ are described in sections 3.252–3.254: ‘Intention’ is about the psychological preparedness of the subject for the event; ‘ability’ expresses the ability of the subject to carry out the action referred to while ‘version’ expresses its directionality, specifying whether its beneficiary is the subject or those associated with him, or some other party. **Physical** directionality, as in ögür kaz ... učup barîr ärdi (HTs III 777) ‘A flock of geese was ... and flying away’, where **bar-** signifies ‘away’, is not discussed here, as we take this to be a lexical and not a grammatical matter. The use of the auxiliaries yarlıt(g)ka-, ötün- and tägin-, which express the social positioning of the subject, in some cases thereby reflecting politeness and related pragmatic matters, is relegated to section 5.3.

Auxiliaries as described in this section and in section 5.3 have also been called ‘postverbals’; they follow lexical verbs, forming sequences with them. The lexical verb is mostly in the form of a vowel converb, but the -(X)p form (often interchangably with the vowel converb) and the supine in -gAlI are also governed by such auxiliaries, as well as (less often) verbal nominals like the one ending in -mIš and the aorist. Occasionally, lexical verb and postverbal have the same shape, thus lacking a formal sign of government. This is, apparently, what we have in yaylag tagîma agîpan yaylayur turur män (IrqB 62) ‘Climbing the mountain which serves me as summer station I spend the summer there’, where the lexical verb yayla- and the auxiliary tur- both are in the aorist.\(^{439}\)

---

\(^{438}\) Anderson 2002, who deals with the categories described in this section, also posits a category of ‘orientation’ among them, with two members expressing motion away from and towards the speaker: a translocative in bar- ‘to go’, as in äsri amga yalîm kayaka ünîp barmîş ‘A dappled wild goat went up a steep cliff’ (IrqB) and a cisolocative in kâl- ‘to come’, as in süt akîp kâlî ‘milk came flowing out’ (Suv 621,15). uć- ‘to fly (off)’ and uca bar- ‘to fly off’, both used as euphemisms for ‘dying’, are another example for the (not purely spatial) content of this opposition.

\(^{439}\) KP 1.5 has been read as kaš kâzgûn sukar yûrîyur, sansîz tümän özülîg olûrîr and translated as ‘Birds pick (the ground), killing innumerable creatures’. Birds do, of
In Orkhon Turkic we still only find *ïd*- in the meaning ‘to do something completely’, *bar*- used for signifying ‘to gradually get more intense’ and *kör*- with the meaning ‘to make sure one does something’ as auxiliaries, all three joined to the vowel converb; the first two express actionality, the third intention. The incorporation process of *u*-‘to be able’, the fourth early auxiliary, started right after the Orkhon Turkic stage; it gradually became part of a fused morpheme sequence expressing impossibility. The three auxiliaries mentioned first remained independent words, as did the subject pronouns.440

3.251. Actionality
This category deals with the development and change of the event in the course of time. In Old Turkic, actionality is mostly expressed by partly grammaticalised auxiliary verbs; there are, however, also other means to express it. The content of the passive formative -*sXk*- (see OTWF section 7.41), e.g., differs from that of the more common passive formative -*l*- in actionality, among other things: *tutuk*- is ‘to get caught’, e.g., whereas *tutul*- is ‘to be held’ or ‘to be caught’; the -*sXk*- form is marked as inchoative. The task of some marginal deverbal verb formatives consisted of expressing actionality; thus the formative -*gIr*- mainly attested in the DLT and documented in OTWF 539-540 is added to both transitive and intransitive verbs and gives the meaning ‘to be about to carry out the action denoted by the base verb’. The aorist can, beside expressing continuous aspect and continuous action, also express repeated action, as *körür* in *balık taštın tarafılarağ körür ärti* ‘(in his outings from the palace) he used to see the farmers outside the town’ (KP 1,3) or *sözläyürt* in the following passage: *bîrok özünü kilmac tâg ná nâgü iš išlağalî ugrasar (...) tep sözläyürt ärdî* ‘if, however, she intended to do something which she wasn’t supposed to do, she would say º...º (Ü III 54,15). Similarly *ölürür* in *yol yorídaçî yalnûklarnîn âdin tavarîn kunup karmalap özlärin ölürür ärtîmiz* (MaitH XX 13r18) ‘We used to rob the possessions of travellers and kill them’.4

4 course, have the habit of walking about the freshly cultivated earth when looking for worms and the like but, since the context does not make one expect their walking about to get thematicized, *yorîyur* might be transitory towards the auxiliary use of *yorî*. Peter Zieme has, on the other hand, proposed reading *yulîyur* ‘plucks’ instead of this word; this is perfectly possible, as *l*-diacritics are often forgotten by scribes.

440 A single Orkhon Turkic instance of the incorporation of a lexical converb with the auxiliary *ïd*- is mentioned below.
In Uygur the auxiliaries alk-, bar-, bol-, ār-, īd-, kal-, kāl-, tur-, tur-, tūkāt- and yorū- express actionality. This may not be a complete list, as it is often difficult to ascertain whether a verb is fully lexical or an auxiliary; the distinction between these two can be fuzzy to some degree. Take yavašīm birlā yaksişān adrlmalīm ... közi karam birlā ... kūläšūgīn\textsuperscript{441} oloralīm (M II 8,20). This could mean ‘Let’s draw close, me and my gentle one, and never separate; may my black-eyed one and me sit and laugh in company’, taking olor- to be lexical; or, if olor- is understood as an actionality auxiliary, it could mean ‘may we keep laughing together’. The translation of T.Tekin 1968: 290 for tūrk bilgā xagan tūrk sir bodunug, oguz bodunug īgidū olorur (Tuñ 62) takes olor- to signify ‘to rule’ (as it clearly sometimes does): “Turkish Bilgā Kagan is (now) ruling, taking care of the Turkish Sir people and the Oguz people”. Anderson 2002 (following Kondrat’ev 1981: 117), on the other hand, takes the verb olur- (as he writes it) of this passage to be a durative auxiliary. A similar sentence occurs in KČ E2: bilgā Köl lê Ċor Tardūš bodunug eti ayu olorū, by Tekin rendered as “... reigned ruling and governing the Tarduš people”. Both interpretations are perfectly possible but we follow Tekin if no unambiguous Old Turkic examples for an auxiliary olor- are brought into the discussion.

Verbs which by lexical meaning denote a stage in the development of an event, e.g. bašla- in nomlagalī bašla- (HTs III 815) ‘to start to preach’, should not be called auxiliaries: They do not create members in a grammatical category. See section 4.23 for such constructions. The Middle Turkic Qišāṣu ‘ānbiyā’ uses -U bašla- to denote the beginning of an action.

The most common construction for expressing actionality is for the auxiliary to govern a converb form of the lexical verb. The most common converb is here the vowel converb; all auxiliaries which can govern -gAll forms are found to govern also -(X)p forms and vowel converbs, and most auxiliaries governing -(X)p forms are found to govern vowel converbs as well. When a particular auxiliary was used in different construction the meaning did not always change, but tur- ‘to get up; to stand’ has two quite distinct actional meanings: The meaning of -gAll tur-, which describes what is about to take place, emanates from ‘getting up’; on the other hand the meanings of tur- with the vowel converb, with the -(X)p form and with the -mīš and aorist

\textsuperscript{441}The facts shows that a reading kūläšūpān as converb cannot be excluded; there is no other instances of kūläš-ūg or kūläš-ūk and such a derivate from an -(X)š- verb would be very much of a rarity.
participles, which describe continuous or repeated activities or states, come from 'standing'.\footnote{The use of tur- as copula, described in section 3.29, also comes from this stative meaning (note that 'stative' comes from Latin stare 'to stand').}

The sequences -U är-, -U yorî-, -U tur- and -U tut- all denote continuing or repeated action. With Qarakhanid -U bar- the action intensifies with time and the speaker witnesses its development. -U kal- also denotes actions which have been going on for some time, but looks at them from a late stage, when they perhaps have become habitual. -U kal- actually says that the action's last stage is being witnessed. -U tükät-, -U alk- and -U id- all three denote completion; -U id- differs from -U tükät- and -U alk- in implying that the completion is reached easily, with momentum and in one drive.

-(X)p är-, -(X)p kal- and -(X)p alk- appear to have had the same meanings as -U är-, -U kal- and -U alk- as described above. The rare -(X)p tur- was used for referring to states reached after the end of the activity described by the lexical verb; whether it was also with durative meaning, as was -U tur-, is not clear. -(X)p bar- is, in the Uygur examples I have encountered, used for describing processes approaching a crisis, as -U bar- referred to above; the counterpart with vowel converb, which I have met only in Qarakhanid, also refers to activities getting stronger as time goes by, but is used with positive meaning as well.

-gAll alk- may have had the same meaning as -U alk- and -(X)p alk-. The common -gAll tur- denotes imminent events while the rare -gAll är- may denote intended actions. The DLT's -gAll kal- states that something almost happened (but then didn’t, or didn’t as yet), thus being, in a sense, the opposite of -gAll tur-. With none of these four auxiliaries used with the -gAll converb is there any actual action going on at the moment of speaking, then, be it that the action has been intended, is imminent, almost happened or has already been completed.

Fourthly, there are auxiliaries governing participles with actional content. The aorist followed by turur denotes continuing action, the meaning it also has with vowel conversbs, and -Ar barîr has the same meaning as -(X)p barîr. -mîš tur- forms descriptions of states following completed actions. bol- is linked to the aorist and to -dAčI for referring to transitions into states; states with future perspective in the case of -dAčI bol-.

Durative meaning appears most commonly to have been expressed by tur(-ur) with the vowel converb. This is also the semantically least
调音：它表示持续或重复的行为，不一定是主动的；持续的tur-，毫无疑问是从表示‘站立’的使用中演变而来的。有一条米契安的例子在kut kolu ałkiş paşik ayu turur sizlar (Wilkens l.6 in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 401) ‘You keep praying for grace and intoning blessings and hymns’。在lude turur ‘keeps sending (again and again)’ (TT X 341)，它的意思是迭代的(id-‘to send’是最终-非变形的)，而它可以是持续的或在例子中如以下所述：busuš kadgu bâlgüsü äşirä turur (TT I 79) ‘The signs of sorrow and trouble keep pursuing (you)’；tsuy irinçülaririmiz asilmadin üklimadin korayu turzun (TT IVB 45) ‘may our sins continuously diminish, not increase or become more numerous’. azkya äşirä yorïyu turzunlar; män una basa yetdim (Suv 615,14) ‘Please walk on a bit; I will have reached you in a moment!’ or yavlak sav bâlgülüg bolü; közünü turur (DKPAMPb 161) ‘an evil matter has appeared and is in current evidence’都显然是持续的：yorï-是非变形的，而közün-是初始-变形的。 participial turur instances: karîšu turur tört ažîgî (ms. U 5396 quoted in the n. to BT XIII 25,4) ‘having four canine teeth which keep on gnashing’；kaxšaşı turur etîlgîn tûmâgîlîn ... kâlîr (BT III 218) ‘she comes along with clanking ornaments’；yalînayu turur trîzûlîn âlîp ... (TT X 358) ‘taking up his flaming trident ...’. There is an example with an inchoative verb in the verse saranlanmak kirîg sakîndaçînîpay / sarîgara turur közi (ETŞ 11,37) ‘The eye of a person who thinks filthy miserly thoughts keeps getting yellow (as an effect of this vice)’. The verb phrase sôzîlîyü turur ârkän is used in U III 57,2, U IV A 233 and B 18 (all in parts of the same text) in contexts that betray durative aspect rather than actionality.

When tur- is used with -(X)p forms of the verb it is not clear whether it is meant to describe states or whether these are instances of lexical tur- ‘to stand’: yavlak yâğı seni közüdîp turur, aartatgalî sakînur seni (ChristManMsFr, ChristFr 8) ‘The evil enemy is continuously (or: ‘standing there and’) observing you, plotting to corrupt you’；ken yezîz köçüçintä iki âmîgi artokrak yaraşîp turur ârdî (U IV B 55) ‘Her two breasts on her wide bosom were standing out very harmoniously’.

With âr- the vowel converb is more common than the -(X)p converb: Examples for -U âr- are quoted in UW 405b–406a, §25 of the entry on âr-. This rather common sequence conveys durative meaning; e.g. kop addâin köyîi közüdî ariêtîr (MaitH XI 4a9) ‘they are engaged in guarding (her, the future mother of Buddha Maitreya) from all dangers’；ulfuš bajlîk[larîg] közüdî ariêtîlî ‘May they continuously guard the towns and cities’ (MaitH Y 16); sastralîg ... agtaru ârîr bîz (HTs VII
we are engaged in translating the ʂâspraś. All examples I have come across describe an agentive activity, not a state or a process.\textsuperscript{443} The sequence -(X)p ār- appears to convey post-terminal meaning, e.g.: ol aşıŋ kim pasšan aska içükä katlap ārř, ymä âıcökä kırür, ol içräki az birlä katalur. (M I 16,6; Manichaean) ‘That lust of yours, which is mingled with food and drink from outside, enters the body and mingles with internal lust’. Other instances for the sequence -(X)p ār- are mentioned in §26 of the entry for ār- in UW 405b-406a; an instance with -mAtIn, the negative counterpart of the vowel converb and of -(X)p, can be found in §27.\textsuperscript{444}

yorï- ‘to walk’ denotes ongoing action when used as an auxiliary, e.g.: kamag on bölök šastr yaradći; amți barça kejûrû yoriyur (HTs V 1 b 5) ‘He composed a šâspra of all in all ten chapters; at present he is busy elaborating on it all’; anta ymä sansız tümän suvdakî tînilçlar buça butarlayu yorîyurlar sorarlar tîkarlär sançarlar (Mait 183v24) ‘There, again, innumerable myriads of water creatures are busy destroying them and tearing them to pieces and they suck them out, sting them and pierce them’. The use of yorï- as auxiliary has to be distinguished not only from the meaning ‘to walk’ but also from the meaning ‘to live’ or ‘to lead a certain way of life’ and from its use as copula (section 3.29). The instance tamidün kurtulup amtî bo kântü uvut yenlärin âjînîrîntä yıldä örtämü yala yorîyurlar (Mait 75v20), e.g., could have the verb yorï- either as auxiliary or in the more literal meaning of ‘walking about’ or just ‘existing’. kayusî muqaçu adînu oynayu kîlâ yoriyurlar (Mait 89r17) could also describe the gods’ way of life and not just their current behaviour, although the sentence is an utterance by somebody who just happens to meet them: He might be extrapolating from his observation. The difference between ār- and yorï- as auxiliaries with the vowel converb may be that the activity is current with ār-, a way of life with yorï-. A further instance governing the aorist of the lexical verb is quoted above in this section. Usually, yorï- governs the vowel converb, this actional phrase leading to the present form in the Oguz languages.

\textsuperscript{443} For -u ār- cf. also Gabain’s n. to 1.1870 of her edition of HTs VII and Röhrborn’s n. to 1.2035 of his edition of the same HTs book. The durative participle suffix -AğAn, which exists in a number of modern Turkic languages, can possibly be the result of a contraction of -A ār-kän; this would assume the existence of a -gAn participle from ār- beside the petrified conjunction ârkän.

\textsuperscript{444} ârmiš in biz[qa] tapińga yûkîngü ürdini berüp ârmiš (U I 8) ‘It turns out that he has given us a jewel to worship’ is, according to UW 392, to be read as turmiš. -gAlIr, mentioned in §27 of the ār- entry, is not a converb, as stated there, but a participle.
tut- ‘to hold’ is in Manichaean texts used for expressing continuously consistent behaviour: *alkînî ûlûm kûrîn ûyû ûta‘ar* (M III nr.8, VII v6) ‘He keeps his mind on the day of death’; *özlûrî saklanu ... tàzgûrû tutunlû‘ar* (M III nr.20, 38, 61 + ZiemeTexterg II) ‘Let them be sure always to be on guard and keep behaving evasively’.

*kûl- ‘to come’* is used as an auxiliary indicating that the action described by the lexical verb has been going on for some time before reaching the state it is at when being narrated; e.g.: *kîlîmîş kázgannyş buyan âdûgî kiltênêrişûng ešîlû bîrîkû kûlî tûs bermâkî ûzû* (DKPAMPb 43) ‘as a result of the good and saintly deeds which he carried out and earned having gradually become a considerable heap and having given fruit’. *kaparu kîlîmîş âtintûk söl suvû* (U III 41, 0-1) is the ‘the lymph liquid (which was) in his flesh which had become quite swollen’. Similarly Qarakhanid *olardên kûlu kûldi ûdûgû törö* (QB 269) ‘From them good laws have been passed down’. *ünu kûl- ‘to come forth’* in Hôllen 102-3, on the other hand, shows *kûl-* in its cislocative meaning.

*kal- is used as auxiliary with vowel and -(X)p converbs to express that the action described is the end stage of a process: *amtû ärîp kalîr ârki sît* (TT II, 2, 7) can perhaps be freely translated as ‘Now it looks like things will soon be over with you’. Similar in content we find IrqB 17: *özlûk at oyn yerdû arîp oynup tûru kalmîş* ‘A royal horse came to a standstill in a desert, exhausted and wilting’. The DLT (fol.16) says that the sequence *-gâll kal* denotes ‘that the action was about to be performed but has not yet taken place’ and gives the following examples: *ol tûrgalî kaldî* ‘He was about to stand up’; *ol bargalî kaldî* ‘He was about to go but had not yet gone’. This is an aspectual content, unlike that of the QB’s (and later) *yaz-*, which expresses the observation that somebody missed the carrying out of an intended act.

*-U bar-* is used with actional meaning in Orkhon Turkic and Qarakhanid but not in Uygur (which has -(X)p bar-* instead): *tûrk bodun ... yokadu barîr ârmiş* (KT E 10) signifies ‘The Turk nation was gradually getting destroyed’. In *tûru ettû bargay kamûg išlàrîn / elîn erta bargay keňgûy yerîn* (QB 5915), on the other hand, the -*U bar-* sequence is positive: ‘All your affairs will prosper more and more, your realm will go on growing and your territory increase’.445

---

445 In *ketû bardî kûndî üzûlût kûcê* (QB 247) ‘His power waned and was broken in a day’, bar - seems to appear in its lexical use and not as auxiliary.
CHAPTER THREE

Uygur bar- ‘to go’ governs -(X)p forms of final-transformative verbs as auxiliary, which should, of course, be distinguished from the translocative meaning of this verb: ätözintä ot mahabutï küçkülg bolup örtänip barïp tüök tükü küsün bergäli umaz (DKPAMPb 536) ‘The fire element in his body comes to dominate, he burns away and is unable to muster energy’ shows a process getting stronger and worse. Then we have mâniy yûräkm yarïlp böksilip barmadin nâçükin turur munï tüg (Suv 626,23) ‘How come my heart doesn’t split and break apart but stays like this?; amtï çaşganï elig közuremäz bolup bardï (U IV A 233) ‘Now king Çaşana has completely disappeared’; an bitigädä savï takï adÖrip barmayok ol; aniñ isig özi üzülmäz (Suv 18,14 + a Berlin fr.) ‘In the court register her case has not yet reached a decision; that is why she isn’t dying’ and înçïp igläyü bïrlï ök sav söz kodup tutar kapar ârkân ölüp bardï (Suv 4,17-19) ‘The moment he got ill he lost the power of speech and, while trying to regain his powers, he suddenly died away’. The last two and in fact also the second example refer to death, which is a sudden change of state. On l,28-9 of a text mentioned in footn. 186 we have two actionality auxiliaries: bo nomka kergünimâçï ciñliq yorïy turur ârkân ök ölüp bargaylar ‘Creatures who do not believe in this teaching will suddenly die right in the middle of their life’. What is common to all the examples is the finality of deterioration, which is what -(X)p bar- appears to have expressed. In nâçä bo ... täñrilär täñri katanları ... üd ârtürürler ârsar, nâçä nâçä kshan üllär årtçar, ançä ançä ödgülïg özleri täñri mäjilïri ârtär barïr (MaitH X 1r17) ‘In the measure that these ... gods and goddesses spend time ... and ... the moments pass, in that same measure do their goodly existence and their divine pleasures gradually get lost’ ârtär and barïr are used in parallel fashion, but the latter was clearly added to express the same actionality as above.

Action which is about to take place is mostly described by the sequence -gÅll tur-: e.g. in samtso açarï oz eliñä bargâli turur ‘The master Tripitaka is about to return to his homeland’ (HTs 5,270). Many of the examples describe imminent danger: muna amtï balik içiñä kîrgâli turur ‘(The monster) is, right at this moment, about to enter the town (fragment quoted in the note to TT V A41). isig özüm üzülgâli turur (U III 37,28) is ‘I am about to die’, ikî yanîm ... oyulup tälingäli turur (U III 37,3) ‘my two sides are about to ... get hollowed out and pierced’; see U III 37,3 and DKPAMPb 1116 and 1129 for further examples. In on minä baflka ... unakîya ölgâli turu täginiürlär (Suv 603,11) ‘10,000 fish are facing imminent death at any moment’ the construction gets
subordinated to tāgin-, a verb denoting ‘experience’. This actional use of tur- accords with its particular meaning when it signifies ‘to get up, arise’ (and not ‘to stand’).

What -gAll är- used in ādgü kīlinēİ bar ārip adīnlarka āvirgālī ārśār (BT II 1201) signifies is not clear, as most of the main clause is in a big lacuna. I tentatively take it to mean ‘be about to (or: intend to) deflect its benefit to others’, somewhat similar to the meaning of -gAll tur-.

The sequence *-gAll ārūr might be the source of the suffix -gAllr, which (also) refers to the imminent future (discussed in sections 3.26 and 3.285). The formation with -gIr- (aorist vowel /A/) attested only in the DLT and discussed in OTWF section 6.3 forms verbs stating that an event is about to take place. In view of its meaning it may have resulted from a contraction of -gAll ār-. What speaks against this is its aorist vowel, which is not /U/ as with ār-, but /A/; the OTWF proposes a different etymology for the formative.

turur is attested also with participial forms of the verb; e.g. with -mĪš: īrinē [yurf]l[i]g umugnuç īnagsīz bo tīnlīgal monītaug āngākīlī [aţun]da tūşmiş tururlar (U II 4.8) ‘these poor hopeless creatures had fallen into such an (existence) of suffering’. This ‘historical present’ clearly describes a resultative state, the situation in which the creatures find themselves after their fall. An early instance with an aorist, yaylayur turur ‘spends the summer’, is quoted above; it refers to a continuing state. Similarly aka enīlār mā barīp kūrīp kīl(a)ız turur (UigBrieffr C 10-11) ‘The elder and younger brothers have not been coming to see us either.’

In tāgrī kīrkīnakın tāgrī ogulanların alkamīş tūrūtme ş ol, kim ol ārgīnnīg özīn tāg ortosīn tāg ... bolup tururlar (BT V 175) ‘He has created446 the divine maidens and divine youths, who have become as the heart and center ... of that throne’ the sequence -(X)p turur is unlikely to be describing an ongoing process; rather, this must be a present perfect, as in a number of modern languages: bol- ‘to become’ is a final-transformative verb in that one is the new thing just after one has finished becoming it.447

446 See the n. to the passage for the unusual use of alka-, apparently copied from Iranian.

447 Not all instances of the sequence -(X)p tur- need have tur- as auxiliary: The sentence key yeiz kōkāzīmā iki amīf(i) ārobrak yaraşiñ turur ārdi (U IVB 55), e.g., probably signifies ‘On her broad chest her two breasts were standing out exceptionally harmoniously’ with tur- in lexical rather than grammatical use. The sequence aorist + ārdi is, however, an instance of an analytical verb phrase.
When added to present or future participles, *bol-* ‘to become’ describes transition into new states, presenting the action as the culmination of a process: In *kenərənə u ənərə bol[t]ar* (KP 68,3) ‘They began to grumble whenever they were serving him food’, *bol-* expresses the entrance into a situation characterised by repeated actions (of grumbling at every meal), i.e. inchoative meaning. Similarly *kəntu kəntu ütüzərəntu ... yid yipər toزار ünər bol[t]ar* in the ms. T III M 168 quoted in the n. to TT VA 117 ‘perfume began emanating from the bodies of each one of them’. In OTWF 386 examples for the construction *-gAn bol-* are quoted from various texts; there, the infinite verb form appears to be used nominally. In *bizni barça utup yeqdıp biznidə öyrə burxan kuťin bułtaəi bol[t]i* (U IV A 265-268) ‘he surpassed all of us and has become destined for buddhahood before us’ the subject is described as just having attained a new future: This is a future inchoative. A complex verb phrase of the shape -(X)gɛl bol-* is found e.g. in *burxanlarka nom tilgənən üvərtgəli ötügen bolćum* (Suv 163,18) ‘I beseeched the Buddhas to turn the wheel of dharma’; in verbal content this is similar to the common phrase üvərtgəli ötünün- (attested e.g. in BT II 114). Cf. also the different construction in *burxanlarlg ... üvərtgəkə ... paraməltərəg toşurtgəka ötügen bol- ... nom təzin ... uktıgəkə ötügen bol-* (Suv 181,17-23). ‘to become one who does ...’. *bol-* appears never to be linked with convers; see section 3.29 for its use with nominal predicates.

We finally turn to the notion that the action referred to by the lexical verb has been completed. This is most commonly expressed by *tükät-* ‘to finish (tr.)‘ as auxiliary governing the vowel converb: *bilgülükin ukgulukın ornatu tükätip temin ək bułaŋ yıpak sayu yəkkələr* (HTs VIII 72) ‘They finished determining how they (i.e. the teachings, accusative) were to be understood and then immediately spread them to all four directions‘ or *kičüm kəsənən kävıllı tükätı* (HTs VII 2097) ‘My powers have waned completely’. Note that kävıl- is intransitive: The auxiliary is in any case tükät-, not tükä- ‘to finish (intr.). Other examples for the sequence are *kürərə tükät-* (ETŞ 13,29), *yarlıkaya tükät-* (HTs V 13 b 27), *kürə tükätip* (HTs V 1 b 13), *kılə tükät-* (HTs V 7 b 11), *ölürə tükät-* (Suv 22,13) and *yoritu tükät-* (ShōAv 288).

In some cases there appears to have taken place a semantic shift from ‘completely’ to ‘already’: *kılə tükätmış āqrə ayıg kılınçərəm* (SuvSündenbek 75) is ‘the gravely evil deeds which I have already carried out‘; similarly öyrə ölərə tükätmış fəniləğər elsewhere in Suv
and öyra kaşimirtä [... v]ji'dš alu tükätiš ardü (HTs III 828) ‘Before, in Kashmir, he had already received instruction’.

alk- ‘to destroy, do away with’ is, as an auxiliary, used with a meaning similar to tükät-; e.g. in sakînë kîlu alksar (TT V A41) ‘when one is through with the meditation’ or sözläp nomlap alkmaguluk ulug buyan üdğü kîlînë (Suv 671,17) ‘punya so great that one should not expect to be ever finished describing or preaching it’. Note that the first-mentioned instance uses the vowel converb, the second the one in -(X)p. In kîlînë kîçin kîra alkip aritïp ... nizvani kîçin kiduwu448 tükätïp (ETŞ 13,109-110) the two actional verbs alk- and tükät- are used in parallel manner. Similarly in känt tägräki bodunug bukunug öllirgäli alkip muna amtî balîk içînä kîrgäli turur (TT X 52) ‘He is now through with killing the population in the town’s suburbs and just about to enter inside the city’, which shows two auxilaries with -gAll, one denoting completed action, the other action just about to start. Cf. also UW 95a, entry alk-, §3.

The auxiliary id- ‘to send off; set free’ refers to actions carried out completely, as oplayu tägip sança idîp topulu ünî (KÇ E7) ‘He attacked head on, routed (sanç-, them) in a whirlwind (id-), pierced (their rows) and emerged.’ In içînî idmiš449 ‘lost (trans.) completely’ (O F2, Orkhon Turkic), the converb suffix (if read correctly) adapted itself to the vowel of the auxiliary: The sequence seems to have already started its way towards morphologization, which we find completed in a number of modern Turkic languages including Turkmen (with the whole verb paradigm) and Khaladj (onlz in the imperative). Though the auxiliary exists also in Uygur, e.g. unîtu id- (Xw 14) ‘to forget completely’, Uygur does not appear to have adapted the converb vowel to this auxiliary’s stem. Nor does this happen in sança idîp topulu ünî (KÇ E7) ‘He routed them in a whirlwind, pierced (their rows) and emerged (on the other side)’.

A ms. which must be late as it has the Mongol loan laggač < nayaču (see the end of § 2.404) on l.72 shows the sequence -(X)p id-: maytri burxannûg yarîğîn bitîp üdîmiç; clearly signifies ‘We have fully written down Buddha Maitreya’s pronouncement’, not ‘we have written and sent off ...’.

---

448 Not kûdû as written in the text.
449 Spelled with d² and s².
3.252. Intention
The verbs *ugra-* and *kör-* are used for expressing that the subject intends to carry out the action denoted by the lexical verb, whereas *kilin-* expresses physical preparation. While *ugra-* just states that there is an intention on the part of the speaker, *kör-* ‘to see, to look’ expresses a conscious intentness towards carrying out the action described in the lexical verb: *kañg yanñ kura kördüm* (DLT fol.541) ‘I tried to string the rigid bow’. This meaning is attested already in the Orkhon inscriptions: *buqadıp kagan yâllı kör temiš* (Tuñ 26) ‘The kagan reportedly got worried and said ‘See to it that you ride fast!’; *saklanu körgil* (TT X 426) ‘Make sure that you take care!’ is an Uygur example. With *ugra-* we have, e.g., *nä nägü iñ iñ âlgäli ugrasar* (U III 54,15) ‘if she intended to commit something’; cf. U III 11,15. What the meaning of *kil-* in aka *enlâr mä barıp körüp âl(a)z turur* (UigBrieffr C 10-11) ‘The elder and younger brothers have not been coming to see us either’ might be is not clear; by the context one might think that it means ‘to make a small effort towards an aim’.

3.253. Ability
The verb *u-* expresses the subject’s ability to carry out the action denoted by the base verb. In early texts, *u-* is sometimes used as a lexical verb: *otsuz savszu kaltü uyûn* ‘How should I manage without grass or water?’ (IrqB 45); *sinidîn ketip nacûk ugay mâñ* ‘How will I manage if I leave you?’ (U III 48,11) is rather similar in content. *bo yer ûtçä nâñ andag iñyv kûr yâllü arvîñ yok kim ùl umasar; š(i)mnû [kfüîçînû kopug ugay* (M II 5,10-11) ‘There is no such trick and magic in this world as he would not be capable of; with the devil’s support he will be capable of everything’. Beside that there are two petrified forms, *u-sar* ‘if possible’ (e.g. in Tuñ 11) and *u-yur* ‘capable person’ (e.g. in U III 5,13).

In its auxiliary use, *u-* always accompanies converb forms of verbs. Most commonly, *u-* follows the vowel converb of the main verb; already so in Orkhon Turkic: *eñiñ ... kûm artatû adaçî ärî* ‘who could have corrupted your realm?’ (BQ 19). The converb vowel of the main verb changes to *-U* in most post-inscritional texts (unless it has this shape already), being involved in a process of morphologization developing in the course of the history of Old Turkic; see Erdal 1979 and 1979b; see section 2.413 above). The two words (the lexical converb and the finite verb of inability) were not yet fused in most of early Uygur, as the particle *ynä* could get between them; e.g. *ölî ymâ umaz biz* (MaitH XX 14r17) ‘Yet we are unable to die’. They are,
however, joined in spelling in Uygur texts in Sogdian script. The QB spells them as one word, with one vowel (U) at the juncture; clearly, fusion had already taken place in a part of the Old Turkic dialects. Most instances are negative, e.g. ädıgüg tätägni idiš bolu umažlar ‘They cannot become the vessel for good taste’. The new suffix -UmA- finds its place among the morphemes of inaction, after the voice formatives.

Several instances of positive fused forms of possibility are, however, found even in the (Qarakhanid) QB, in couplets 2870, 3055, 3789 and 4838.

The normal positive counterpart of -u uma- is, in Uygur, -U bol-, especially when stating not that somebody is unable to do something, but that the action in question cannot be carried out by anybody; Gabain’s note to l.1870 of her edition of HTs VII (§ Ic1) quotes the HTs example örü bolmaz ‘one cannot rise’.

The -gAll form is also well attested with -u-; e.g. in udgurgalï sakïntï, n(ä)ïgy udgurgalï umadï ‘He thought of waking him up but was quite unable to wake him’ (Mait Taf 128 v 25) or körgalï umažlar anïy tärinï (HTs VIII 41) ‘They are unable to see its depth’. Its positive form is less common than the negative: An example for it is anï näçïk utgali yegaldïlgï uyay sizlär (U IV A 77) ‘How will you be able to win against him?’; -gAll uyay appears also in TT X 81.

-gAll bol- and its negative counterpart are similar in content, but are usually meant to hold for any subject; e.g. bilgïli bolmadi ‘it was impossible to recognize (something)’, tavräk bargalï bolmadi (HTs Tug 13a22) ‘it was impossible to advance speedily’, nïgy okartïn ozgalï ... bolmaz (BT II 927) ‘It is quite impossible to escape from them’, anïn bolur bolgalï yalgïnlara elïg xan (Suv 562,3-5) ‘therefore they can become people’s rulers’, or keinïn tärinïn tïpkgalïli ... bolmaz (BT I A2 12) ‘One cannot fathom its breadth or its depth’. Cf. also BT XIII 4,4 and HTs VII 26 and 47. In antpäk kïïlïr bir tïg ašïdgalï bolïlïr ... nomlarïg ‘The people who were there were all equally able to hear ... the sïïras’ (HTs VI fol. 26v) the -gAll bol- sequence has an explicit subject; we find tâlgalï boltum in HTs III 372. The note to HtsBriefe 1870 (§ Ic) quotes some additional ‘impersonal’ examples but also one in the 3rd person plural.

The DLT apparently replaced -gAll bol- with -sA bol-: tïlim sïzïlg aksa bolmas, yalïm kaya yïksa bolmas (fol.453) ‘One cannot understand blathering words as one cannot tear down a cliff’; köïjïl kïmïlï bolsa

---

450 Assuming that alkumaz (325) really signifies ‘He is unable to destroy’ and alumadï (86) ‘he was unable to take’; the contexts of both words are completely destroyed.

451 Cf. körgalï umažlar anïy tärinï ‘They are unable to see its depth’ above.
kalî yok čiğay / kišla küçün bolmas anï tok bay (fol.550) ‘One cannot make somebody satiated and rich by force if he has a poor man’s heart’.

Rağğiże has the same construction (documented in Schinkevitsch 1926: 79).

The QB, the other great Qarakhanid text, has -U bil-: bâgig kulda adra bilûr mü özüm (4836) ‘Can you distinguish between lord and servant (after they die)?’; köndrü bilmäz yorïk (2077) ‘He is unable to correct his behaviour’.

The -(X)p gerund is much less common with u-; we have it e.g. in tutup ugay (Mait Taf 129 v21 in fragmentary context) or in özümün bâşgarïp unayokum ârûr (r63 of a colophon published in AbiShôtan p.76) ‘this is a case of my being unable to succeed’.

-gU täg ârmäz is another construction expressing impossibility, e.g. in ögrünçe[ümüz] tükätı sözlägü täg ârmäz (TT II,1 55) ‘our joy is quite indescribable’. If the phrase is to express for whom the action referred to is impossible, the subject is referred to by a possessive suffix added to -gU: bû montag tod vetica savlarin kûrüp sârgûm täg ârmäz ‘I cannot bear to see such vile things (happening to my country)’ (U I 41). See section 3.284 for the construction -gU täg.

-gUlXk är- also appears to express possibility and ability, but the possibility emanates from the object and not from the verb’s subject, e.g.: alp tüpkärâgülük ârûr (BT I D 184) ‘It is difficult to fathom’. In büttürâgülük ârmäz ârti (Suv 602,12) ‘It was impossible to bring in order’ and kimkâ unûg ûnag tutguluk ârti (HTs VII 1673) ‘With whom could one have sought refuge?’ the content is transferred into the past. With reference to the subject in a genitive and a possessive suffix added to the -gUlXk form we have adînlarnişi bîlgülükî ârmazlär (Suv 377,7) ‘They cannot be known by others’.

The verb yaz- ‘to miss’ appears to have become an auxiliary in the language of Kâşgâri: He translates ol anî uru yazdï (fol.470) as ‘He almost struck him’. This appears beside the sentence ol käyikni yazdî ‘He missed his shot at the game’. It is therefore likely that yaz- did not, at that stage, denote unintended actions which nearly happened, but only actions which the subject just failed to carry out. Hence the mention of this auxiliary in the section on ability, here rather inability. Cf. however the DLT’s -gAlI kal- above.

3.254. Version

The Old Turkic category of ‘version’ specifies either the subject itself or another entity as the beneficiary of the action referred to in the sentence. The object version or benefactive is in Old Turkic expressed
by the verb followed by ber- ‘to give’ as auxiliary, the subject version or self-benefactive by al- ‘to take’ as auxiliary.

al- may signify ‘to do for one’s own sake’, or ‘for the sake of the subject’s own party’; e.g.: tokuz oguz terä kovratu altïm ‘I gathered and organised my Tokuz Oguz nation’ (ŠU). § 22 of the UW entry for al-lists quite a number of verb phrases consisting of vowel or -(X)p converb and having the meaning ‘für sich (tun)’, e.g. tägšür ù altï ‘für sich getauscht / sich eingetauscht’ in Mait.

The benefactive is quite common with the vowel converb, e.g. ada öçü(r)gü icïn sakinï açï berälim ... ayagïš bolmak dyan sakinï udïn açï berälim ... yak icäglärig okïmak törosïn sözläyï berälim (TT VA 75, 98, 115) ‘Let us inform you of the meditation serving the allaying of dangers ... of the time for the meditation by which one gets honoured ... of the ceremony for the invocation of demons’. açï ber- appears with this meaning also in KP 13.2, M III nr.7III, 15,111, MaitH XI 3r16 or in the QB, sözläyï açï in DKPAMPb 57. Similarly in a source from the Mongol period (details mentioned in footn. 186): tört yïnakdïn bo nom ärdïnïn keçürï yada berïnlïr (49-51) ‘Be so nice as to spread this doctrine jewel in all four directions’. körtgïrï bergï yärtï kim köni yoka ... yorïzïnlar yärtï ‘Would he graciously show ..., so that they would take the right road’ is from an early text, TT VI 237. In the Manichæan corpus we have e.g. inça kaltïn i väga kapagïn yerdï açï berïrïcä ançïlayu-ma xroštag täïrï xormuzta täïrïkä heb täïrïkä kapagïn açï bertï (M I 13,9-12) ‘Just as water is useful in opening the gate of plants in the earth, quite in the same way the god Hroshtag graciously opened the gate of the Fivefold God to the god Ohrmïz’d. The sentences inïm aïçïm ... icïn bïnjïgïnïm452 tïkä bertï (E28,7) ‘My younger and elder brothers built this memorial for me because of ...’ and balbal kïlu bertïm (BQ S7) ‘I erected a stele for (him)’ are both from runiform inscriptions. Qarakhanid use is identical: nïgü kïlmïş ï ... aïcï bïnjïgïnï sän adra sïçä yora berïŋ (QB 797) ‘You explained to me your actions clearly and in detail’. bolu berdi ävrïn (QB 1642) is by Dankoff translated as ‘The firmament smiled upon him’; bolu ber- just means ‘to be in somebody’s favour’.

In the sentence eçïmïz Sïntar Šïliquï bitigïlï aydïmïz, “baššap berïŋ” tep ‘We asked our brother Sïntar Šïli to write (it), saying ‘do us a favour and start’ (Mait colophon edited by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133) ber- governs the -(X)p converb and not the vowel converb. Laut translates the direct speech as ‘Fang gleich an!’.

452 The second vowel is not explicit but is assumed to be there because it is explicit in an instance in the Ongin inscription.
where ‘gleich’ is presumably meant to correspond to *ber*- His idea would accord with the meaning of *ver*- as auxiliary in Turkish.

Schönig 1996: 211 (footn.) proposes still another meaning for the auxiliary *ber*- as we find it in the sentence *olorupan Türk bodunan elin törösün tuta bermiş, eti bermiş* (KT E 1, BQ E 3): He suggests it should be translated as ‘they began to organize and rule (the state and institutions of the Türk people)’, which is how the sequence -A *ber*- would be translated in a number of modern Turkic languages. This seems a less likely possibility in view of all the examples of vowel converb with *ber*- quoted above, or an example as the following (where ‘beginning’ makes no sense): *yarlïkačuši bililig burxanlag kün tąğı Köp kamag tünîlgînlîg ämgäklîg taloy öğižlîrin suguru berzün* (MaitH XI 9r27) ‘May the compassionate Buddha like the sun graciously dry up the sea of suffering of all creatures.’ Schinkewitsch 1926: 91 quotes a number of examples of the vowel converb + *ber*- from Rabgüzü and thinks that *ber*- gives them the meaning of completion (the converse of Schönig’s idea); I think all of these as well are best understood as having benefactive meaning.

Signifying ‘to favour with doing, to deign to do’, *ber*- is an auxiliary of politeness in Orkho Türkic and Qarakhanid. Uygur has *yarlï(g)ka-* instead; see section 5.3 for these and other pragmatic of verbs.

### 3.26. Aspect and tense

This section deals with the temporal structuring given by the speaker either to events within themselves (‘aspect’) or with respect to other events referred to (‘taxis’) or with respect to the speaker or writer’s moment of speaking or writing (‘tense’). All finite indicative verb phrases are, first of all, characterised for aspect and taxis. To express tense and / or taxis, they can be transposed into a (relative) future by the addition of *ärgäy* and into a (relative) past by the addition of the forms of the preterite, *ärtim* etc. Thus e.g. an event referred to by a final-transformative verb (‘to have somebody get mounted’) presented not as internally structured but looked at from its final point, in past taxis and past tense: *išneičkä atlanturđi ärti* ‘he (the king) had had (him, his son) mounted for recreation’ (KP 1,1). The following passage (Wettkampf 26-31) recounts one and the same (iterative) event in two versions differing in aspect: *ol öðün ýagï w(o)rm(ï)zt tegin bo tört sav ägzïnä tutdï; kanta barsar käsär kîrsäɾ tašïksar olorsar tursar bo tört sav ag(î)zdä tutar ärti* ‘Then the valiant prince Wormïzt kept repeating
these four terms: wherever he went or came, entered or exited, sat or stood he would repeat these four terms.

Orkhon Turkic and Uygur differ in the forms they use for expressing the future, -dAkI in Orkhon Turkic where the rest of Old Turkic uses -gAy. The distribution is a bit different for the negative future: -mAci, the inscriptive form, stays in use in a few early Uygur texts beside positive -gAy. A peculiarity of Buddhist Uygur taxes are the proximative forms, absent from Orkhon and Qarakhanid Turkic and from Manichaean sources: -yOk and -gAlIr, which express vivid past and imminent future respectively. When using these forms, the speaker stresses the relativity of the temporal reference with respect to the point of the event or, more commonly, to the point of speech.

The means used for the expression of aspect and tense, consisting of synthetic and analytic verb phrases, partly overlap with those used for expressing other contents, e.g. the category of actionality or the expression of irreal wishes or conditions. The contents of -yOk and -gAlIr also have a lot to do with epistemic modality, since speakers and writers using these forms base the degree of `reality' of past or future events on their perception of their personal present, or the present as presenting itself at the moment of the action referred to.

Stylistic modes of particular texts determine the selection of types of verb phrases used in them or the inventory of forms. Verb form sequences within single sentences can often, in themselves, not be assigned any tense or aspect content; not only because this depends on the semantics of the verb, but also because of dependency on the context. The most meaningful form to deal with the matter is to consider sequences of verb phrases in whole passages. This task, however, demands monographic treatment, not the space we can assign to it here. The following account of tense and aspect in indicative and not indirective verb phrases can only be a rough approximation.

-Ur etc. and -mAç usually express imperfective aspect. It is to make this aspect explicit that we find e.g. šala sögüt tsıp sögütkä oxšar ärip ‘the šala tree is similar to the oak and ...' instead of ‘oxšap’ in HTs III 212, or tiňlığlar anılayu ok turur ärip sansarlıg kık titigdä (Abhi A 41b5) ‘creatures remaining in that way in the green mud of sansāra' instead of ‘turup'. By itself, the aorist often refers to the time of speech or writing; just as often, however, it is timeless, as in inscriptive yerimin suruýun konar köçär bän ‘I alternately settle and migrate in my domain'. The aorist – the form ornamaz in the following example – can also describe a state of affairs which started out at some point in the
past and still holds: *inêca sakîntim ... mini ... dendar kilgay siz tep. inêîp amîktâgî mâniy könlûm nâyr ornamaz* (TT II, 1 40) ‘I thought you would ... make me into an elect. Till now, however, my heart has not been calming down’.

In some contexts more than others, the temporal scope includes the future. The Maitrisimit, which narrates the future appearance of Buddha Maitreya in great detail, chooses the aorist as main narrative form, e.g. *mâytri burxan ... sinxî elig xanka inêca tep yarîkâyur* (Mait 26A 9–10) ‘Buddha Maitreya will speak to king Sinhâ as follows’. The reason for the use of the aorist in such prophesy may be the perception of predestination, or an expression of the experience of the seer. In some cases, some of the events related are, of course, intra-terminal: *yer suvlar ... tâprüyûr kamêâyurlar ... tâprü yahûklar ... yîgilurlar ... kuvsr âygal yîgîmîsta ken turum ara ulug tîgi çögni ün kügü eştîlûr yuğant ûdtûk tûg ulug hûdûk ot yallên köçînûr* (MaitH XX 1r2-13) ‘The worlds ... rock and shake ... gods and humans assemble ... After the multitude is assembled, great roars and sounds are suddenly (= turum ara) heard. Great and high flames as in the yûgânta age are (or: become) visible.’ Nor is there in the quoted example any formal differentiation between imperfective and perfective on the sentence level, between temporal frame and single event, e.g. concerning the great flames which are either a visible background or which become visible as a member in a chain of events. Interrogative reference to predicted events also uses the aorist: *ken költüçî burxanlar burxan âtîn kanta bulûrîl?* ‘Where will the future Buddhas attain Buddhadom?’. When, in U II 31,49, we read of Indra asking (himself?) the question *bo tûgir aurišî kayu yeti azûnlarig tûginûr ârki* ‘Which seven existences will this divine boy experience, I wonder?’, he (and the intended readers) know that he has immediate access to the answer. A present reality of the future is implied also by *tûgir* in the following instance, an address to a sort of oracle: *yanturu öz ulušum[ka] barîp adasîc; âsên tûgîr ârsîr mân, bo xwaliq psak bod[isatv]nînîd ûdok elgintû turzûn* (HTs III 919) ‘If I am to return to my own country and arrive there safe and sound, may this wreath cling to the bodhisattva (statue)’s holy hand’.

Imperfectivity is transferred into the past by the constative preterite of the copula, e.g. *anêçulayu amrar ârti siznî tûzûgî anasî[n] b[alasî]*

---

453 The aorist has of course become the normal future tense in many modern Turkic languages, new forms having been created to describe events going on at the moment of speaking or during the point of time being referred to. This process did not, however, as yet take place in Old Turkic, where the -Ar form is a real ‘aorist’ not yet seriously challenged by more focussed present forms such as -Yû turur
oglanï sävärä (Pothi 98-99) ‘they all loved you as children love their mother’ or ymâ bir kûn bo tagda [ôt]mâk aš ašâyur ârdîm. [ôr]jî üç ävrân yîlân [kältî]lär ‘Well, one day I was eating bread and food on this mountain (and) three dragons came towards (me)’ (DreiPrinz 42).

There are many other examples in UW 400b-401a, § 17b of the entry on âr-. The sequence is common already in Orkhon Turkic, as kîl têgin bir kîrk yâş ayur ârtî ‘K.T. was 31’ (KT), tûrk bodûn tabgačka körür ârtî ‘The Türk people were subject to China’ (Tuñ), atîg ika bayur ârtîmîç ‘we used to tie the horses to trees’ (Tuñ) and the like.

In miträ burxan kâlgây tepän kûdügli ârtîmiz (M II 6,10) ‘You have been waiting for the prophet Mithra to arrive’ we have the participle in -dXm with the preterite form of the copula; this rare instance is presumably synonymous with the aorist construction.

The constative preterite (i.e. the one not explicitly marked as evidential) is expressed by members of the paradigm -dXm etc.; used by itself, this form normally expresses anteriority relative to the moment of speaking or writing. The form is exceedingly common; Zieme 1969: 148 determined that its frequency in his corpus compared to that of -mîš is roughly 10 : 1. The simple constative preterite serves the narrative mode, as even processes which obviously took some time can be presented as point events: otuz yâşima beš balîk tapa sülädim (BQ E28) ‘In my 30th year of life I campaigned against Beş Balîk’. In tûrk bodûn ičän tûn udimadîm kûntûz olormadîm ‘For (the sake of) the Turk nation I did not sleep at night, nor did I rest in daytime’ (BQ E22) there is (metaphorical) reference even to repeated situations. Zieme 1969: 148-9 lists numerous Manichaean examples for the constative preterite.

When a verbal lexeme denotes a process, its preterite can express the state reached in its culmination. Thus with the verb açî- ‘to become hungry’454 e.g. in BT XIII 2,36: “ay baba, yemîş [ber bizi] açîmîç ikâgü” tep [tedîl] âr “Oh dear, [give us] food, we are both hungry” they said. Similarly with indirective status: batoçkalarîmînî karnî açmîş ‘My dear little camel colts have evidently gotten hungry’ (BT XIII 2,39).

In the following example the -d+ form refers to the future, presented as something which has ‘practically’ already taken place, to signal a clear intention (in fact a lie; the speaker intends to do something quite different): azya öyğä yarîyu turzählär; män una basa yetdîm (Suv 615,14) ‘Please walk on a bit; I will have reached you in a moment!’.

---

454 It had a long vowel, unlike the verb açî- signifying ‘to open’. For the semantics cf. Turkish açik-; açkâm ‘I am hungry’. 
The use of the presentative particle *una* is meant to support this intention. TT I, an oracle book, has some sentences in which a conditional is followed by a *-d* form: *äd tavar tiläsär bultug taptun* (TT I 11); *täpräsär akïntï; täprämäsär yagäd/dïï* (TT I 204-5). These can be translated similarly, as ‘If you are in pursuit of possessions you will soon have them’ and ‘If you move it will be your undoing; if you don’t move you will have won’. The use of *-sAr* does also, grammatically speaking, allow these to be references to the past: ‘When you were in pursuit of possessions you got them’ and ‘When you moved you were undone; when you didn’t move you prevailed’.

The preterite in *-dXm* etc. is followed by *ärti* e.g. in *sintu ögüz suvin kăçăr ârkan bir yük nom suvda kâlt ärti. aïn bitip âdïmïk kim ken kâltïçi arkiš* ... (HTs VII 2048) ‘While we were crossing the waters of the Indus river, a load of holy books had gotten lost in the water. We have written down and sent their names, so that a messenger coming later (can bring other copies)’. This pre-preterite appears also in *tïši tïnïk bïrlï yazïntïmïz ârdi; ol ayïg kïlinë kâçïntï ùlïg tamularda [tugdumuz]* (MaitH XX 14v16) ‘We had sinned with female creatures; as a result of that sin we were born in the large hells’. Another instance containing the particle *çak* is quoted from the Hami DKPAM ms. in section 3.341 below.

Finite *-yOk*, in use only in Buddhist Uygur, expresses a vivid view taken of the event after it took place and implies the speaker’s notion and communicative intention that the event is relevant for the moment of speech; we have therefore called the form ‘vivid past’. Hence we find it used exclusively in quotes of direct speech. The event referred to has generally been directly observed by the speaker. The sentence *bašïmazdakï kara saçïmaz uçi bölöki kïrgïladyok ol* (U III 55,16) ‘The black hair on our head – its ends and dividing line have become grey’ is uttered by hunters whose hair instantly turns grey upon receiving the order to kill a saintly bodhisattva elephant against their conscience, or face the murder of their own families to the 7th generation. A mother who learns of her son’s decision to sacrifice himself says *ikïnï açunta bargalï sakïnyok sån* ‘you have just decided to go to another existence’ (U III 48,6). The sentence *ataj ... saya yakïn kïlyok ol* (U III 64,5) ‘Your father ... has approached you’ is said about himself by a father come to murder his son. *bo montag til tïsïyok mën’tep sözlïyur ârdï* (U III 54,15) ‘...I have had such and such a dream’ i s what queen Bhadrä asserts whenever she needs an excuse for the sin she is about to propose to her addressee; the ‘dream’ is meant to serve as a justification.
for the proposal. män ... tîlkû ažunînta tugyok män (Pañc 47) ‘I have been born a fox’ thinks the fox, going on to reflect on what his nature enables him to do about the situation he is confronted with, as distinct from what other animals can do: The birth evidently did not take place in the immediate past, nor does it need to be asserted, but it is relevant for the matter at hand. The sentence “bulyok mu ärki burxan kutîn azu bulmayok mu ärki” tep tegülük (BT I D 195) ‘One should say ‘Has he just attained buddhahood, I wonder, or hasn’t he?’’ proposes to see the event as a drama of current significance; it is important for showing that -yök is compatible with the epistemic particle ärki. nom bitiqlärin tâlim yîgyok män (HTs V 59) ‘I have collected his spiritual writings in great quantity’ says Xuanzang in India when he worries that it will be difficult to have then all transported to China. amti sîzlâr [ … â]mgângülük oronka kälyök [s]îzlâr (Bang & Rachmati, Höllen 14-15) ‘Now you have just arrived at the place of suffering’ is what visitors to some part of hell are told in a Divine Comedy-like tour. A passage in TT X 336 further highlights the use of the form by pinning it against the aorist: körgil amti yäklär bägi vayš ir(a)vani a! ... on küčlüg täpri burxan atavakî yäknîn orînta tâprânêsz yarp oloryok ol. ... ancakya ynâ korkmatîn âymânîntîn olorur. yavlak sakînçîf atavakî yäk iki köçintîn ört yalîn [ü]ntûrîp täpri burxan üzâ ida turur ‘Look now, Vaiśrāvana, lord of the demons! The divine Buddha ... has seated himself, immobile and firm, at the place of the demon Âtavaka. He is sitting there, without a bit of fear or anxiety (while) the evil-thinking demon Âtavaka keeps emitting fire and flames from his two eyes and sending them at the divine Buddha’. The use of this form is discussed and further documented by D.M. Nasîlov 1966.455

The vivid past can be transferred into the past: “ol âr nätâg osoglug körlük mînîzîg ârdî?” subatra rîši yaça inêcä tep tedi: “karazâ ton kädyok ârdî.” (U III 57,8) “How were the looks of that man?” Subhadrâ, the female elephant said as follows: “He had put on a monk’s gown”. The vivid past participle has to be used because käd- signifies ‘to put on’ and not ‘to wear’ and because the way the person referred to was dressed is relevant for current action on the part of those involved in the story’s drama. The sentence sansardîn inîn y oguç ârtîyok ârdî, kîlyok ârdî alku kîlguluk išlärîn, ałkyok ârdî az ulerî nîzvaniîg ayîglarîg (U III 88,3-4) ‘He (the arhat Upasena) had just reached the bank beyond sansâra, had just accomplished everything he had to do

---

455 He also points out that it survives in just this function and meaning in Hakas and Tuvan; Elisabetta Ragagnin can document it from Dukha, a variety of Tofa spoken in Mongolia.
and had just done away with lust and with the other evils of passion’ has a similar -YoK ärti phrase. It does not appear in direct speech but the vivid past content is highly relevant to the point being made: Upasena lies down and then, suddenly, his brother Sena, reborn as a snake, comes and stings him, instilling his deadly poison.

Followed by är-miš, the -YoK form gets coupled with indirectivity, as in Suv 8.10: inča tep tedilär: “ay [ær]-a bizni sini algali [id]tokda aşnuça an bitigđi körtilär. an bitig ičintä saniŋ oz yas sani sakši takš tikāmâyök ärmiš. tāk šan munc’a munča tiniqlarig olärmiškä ol saniŋ oz alimülärninı uğurınta anıń sini [algali] idtilar. munı şan bılişi [kärgäk]’” tep tedilär ‘They said the following: ‘O man! When they sent us to fetch you they first looked into the judgement register and it turned out that your time to die hadn’t come yet. They sent (us) to fetch you only because you have caused the death of so and so many living beings, and for the sake of those to whom you owe lives’’. The relevant sentence is marked as a quotation through ärmiš but, since it emanates from divine prescience, is nevertheless able to refer to the moment of speaking. Note that all the examples have the 1st or 2nd person as topic, even when the subject is the 3rd person.

The perfect participle in -mIš usually links with the copula to give verb phrases with perfect, i.e. post-terminal meaning. -mIš followed by ärür (or ärmüž) and personal pronouns expresses the ‘normal’ post-terminal or present perfect. This type of verb phrase should not be confused with the indirective (for which see section 3.27), which always consists of -mIš without the aorist; e.g. alši yuc tuımın yil ärmiš ärür ‘six million years have passed’; toyın bolmak küšsiñ mana yakın kälmiš ärürlär (MaitH XVI 1v3) ‘they have approached me with the wish to become monks’; kün täpri tugmiš ärür. ... odunuglar ‘The sun has risen ... Wake (pl.) up!’ (MaiTh XV 11v22); anım ... yeläyü at amtiş ärür (BT I B(128)) ‘Therefore there have been given fake names’ or mān xwentso öŋra änätäkkä barmişta alp adašiq yolta ır keč ämgämniš[ka] iğliğ kämlig bolmiš ärür mān (HTs VII 1035) ‘As I suffered hardship on the hard and dangerous road when I, Xuanzang once went to India, I have become sickly’. In the following question and answer, the question consists of a -mIš form while the answer has -mIš ärür: ‘nägininį küčintä bo agulug yilanlar bo montag körksüz ažunta tugmišlar? otgurak aksi: övkä nişvanı küčintä munta tugmiš ärürlär (MaitH Y 174-6) ‘Due to what causes have these poisonous snakes been born into such an ugly existence? He understood it clearly: They have been born into it due to the vice of anger.’ tugmišlar in the question appears to expect an
indirective answer: The questioner would be content with second hand information but is offered first-hand post-terminal information. This passage exemplifies the close association of indirectivity with post-terminality.

The content of -miš ol is not indirective either; it is hard to say in what it differs from -miš ärüür: tăşrî kirkînîn tăşrî aqûlûnîn aklamî törütmiş ol (BT V 175) ‘He has created the divine maidens and divine youths’. Several additional examples of this are found in HTs V 126-133, e.g. plural forms in kôk tăşrî yanîn kilmîşlar ol ... üd kololar etiğin yaratmişlar ol ‘They have done it according to the manner of the sky ... have created instruments for (measuring) time units’. This is not the indirective as Xuanzang is describing what he saw in a country he visited. We find the phrase in a relative clause in kisgač kim kântû ol ok tâmirân etîmiş ol ‘tongs, which are themselves made of that same iron’ (M I 7-8). In tört yînâk [ye]jtîrâr may turkî yer[tâ e]dîz lanxan tartmiş ol (HTs III 901) ‘They have erected a high fence in a distance of seven steps on all four sides’ and ol yarok yaşûk važîr önlûg alkatmiş yer ... beş böîkûn bölmiş ol (BT V 188-191) ‘That bright and shining praised land with a diamond appearance is divided into five parts’ one would expect târîl- and bölül- if these were normal finite phrases. These two instances and perhaps also the one in the Manîchæan (M I) relative clause were perhaps perfect participles in predicative but still nominal use.

There is a periphrastic construction consisting of the perfect participle in -miš with possessive suffix referring to subject followed by bar: mâniy yma burxan kuûya külüg kûsanûg könjûl örtümîşim ... bar (MaitH X 3r7) ‘It has happened that I was strongly aroused towards buddhahood ...’; sizlärni tüziyên yavaş könjûlûguzîrîn artatmişim bar ârîsâr (DKPAMPb 643) ‘If I happen to have corrupted your noble and mild hearts, ...’. Nominal subjects accompanying the -miš form appear in the nominative: note the 3rd and 1st person possessive suffixes referring to these subjects: öprâ yma bodîsaârlar munçulaçu ärdini buška kälmîši bar ârti (KP 49,1-2) ‘It had happened before as well that bodhisattvas came in this way to ask for jewels for (giving as) alms’; mân xventso ästitmišim bar (HTs VII 218) ‘I Xuanzang have heard (the following)’. If the -miš form had been purely nominal and this had not been an analytical form, the subject could have been in the genitive. The contexts do not warrant any interpretation of this construction by which these nominatives would be instances of left dislocation.

The perfect is transferred into the past by the addition of the preterite of the copula, giving a pluperfect; examples are vipâši atlîg burxan
The Buddha called V. had appeared on earth' or 'üküš üg ötgürmiš topolmuş ärdilär (HTs VIII 55) 'They had penetrated a lot (of texts)'. The perfect can also be transferred into the future, as e.g. in bulunęsz üg ötgürmiš täginmiš ärgäylär (TT VI 429) 'They will have realised unattainable dharma'. Elsewhere the sequence -mIš ärgäy expresses presumption (discussed in section 3.27).

A speaker using a future form referring to a point in time subsequent to the time of speaking is exercising a judgement on an event which has not yet taken place. Its use therefore implies the choice as marked member of the epistemic mood category. The future tense is expressed by the suffix -dAçI in the runiform inscriptions of Mongolia, by -gAy in other Old Turkic sources. Finite -dAçI is negated as -mAçI, e.g. oılmäci yılmäci sän 'you will not die and not disappear' (ŠU E 9); further examples appear in Tuñ IE6 and Ongin R2. We have -mAçI also in early Manichaean and Buddhist Uygur, e.g.: kačan nāği äczūg sözlämäci män (Mait 11 r11) 'I will by no means ever tell lies'; kök kalğdin kozlug yagmur [yagdokin közin] körgäy sizlär; ütönin ol ämgäk tolgağ kötägäy täginmači sizlär (MaitH XX 1v3) ‘You will see with (your) eyes how rain of embers falls from the sky (but) with your body you will not feel that pain.’

The inscriptional future taxis is transferred into the past tense by the preterite of the copula, e.g. Türk bodun adak kamşattı, yavlak boltaçı ärti (BQ E31) ‘The Turk people tottered and were about to be routed'; bunça yum tırgi kış boltaçı ärti, öülü yurda yolta yatu kaltacaça ärtigiz (KT N9) ‘All these (my mother the queen, my mothers, elder sisters, daughters in law and princesses) who would survive would become female slaves and the dead among you would be left lying in deserted camps and on the road’. Then there are instances in the main clauses of irreal conditional sentences: köl tegin yok ärsär kop oltacça ärtigiz (KT N10) ‘If K.T. did not exist you would all have eventually been killed’. yok örtäcça ärti (Tuñ 54-55) appearing in the same construction is quoted in section 4.64 below. Uygur has numerous sequences of -dAçI ärti (examples are quoted or mentioned in UW 404b, §22b of the entry är-) but in all of them the -dAçI form serves as present participle and is not part of an analytical phrase. Verb phrases with the shape -gAy ärti

456 The editors mistakenly 'emend' the -mAçI form to 'tägimnädači'.
457 I do not think this refers to 'step mothers' as Tekin would have it; with the possessive suffixes on mothers, elder sisters etc. the prince probably refers to all females in his tribe.
which I have come across do not, on the other hand, indicate a point in time which is in the speaker’s future or a point of time in any relationship at all to the time of narration, but appear in modal constructions (see section 5.1). This may be a coincidence, or the task of inscriptional -dāčl ārtī may in Uygur have been filled by the phrase -gAllr ārtī, of which we quote an instance in the next paragraph.

Uygur and Qarakhanid have an ‘imminent future’ expressed by the suffix -gAlIr. E.g. aglïk kurug bolgalîr ‘The treasury is about to get empty’ (KP 7,7); alko išläyä tükâdimiz. yenä ymä kün tägri uyakgalîr. amiñ kântü kântü ârgülük [â]vkä baralîm ‘We have finished all our work. Moreover, the sun is about to set. Now let us each go to the houses we are to stay in’ (Mait 12v2); ya kurup ok atgalîr (TT I 162) ‘He is bending his bow and about to shoot an arrow’. In Qarakhanid we have the form in two couplets: sävînä arzu ni’mät turu kalgalîr / sâkiñë kadgu mihnät maña kâlgâlîr (QB 1074) ‘Joy, desire and happiness are about to stay away; trouble, sorrow and affliction come my way’; sezîksiz oïüm bir kün axir kâlr / tiirîmîs bî canlıg canîn algalîr (QB 1472) ‘There is no doubt that Death will one day come; he will soon take the soul of this living being’. See section 3.285 for infinite uses of this form; the imminent future expressed by -gAllr ār- (see this in section 3.251) may be its source.

Transposed into the past we get, e.g., utr[u] tîdgalîr ārti; anî üçün tîdmadî[458] (ZiemeTexterg r5) ‘He was about to oppose and hinder him; that is the reason he didn’t do so’.

Uygur uses bol- ‘to become’ (for which see section 3.29) with the perfect participle in -mîš for presenting the activity as a transition of the subject into a new state: nomlayu yaṛîkamiş boltî ‘he has deigned to preach’, on törlüg äügî kîîmîç kîîmî kârgâk; ogînä kaçînâ utî sävînë tâqurmîs bîlur (BT XIII 12.036)[459] ‘(They) should carry out the ten types of good deeds; (they) will have given pleasure to their parents’ or dyan at üçä körückmîş boltî ‘he has thus presented them by the dhyâna name’ (Buddhist); yernî mä kâri kîshîni unînmîş bolguy sîn ( Brieffr C11-12, a letter) ‘(If you do not come to see us but stay where you are), you

[458] The ms. (Manichæan writing) has tîdmâdû, which I take to be an error; it might indicate that the ms. was copied from a source in Uygur script, where Ž and ’ can be similar.

[459] The editor pieced this sentence together from mss. B and C; that it should be attributive to šlok ‘verse’ (as he thinks) seems unlikely to me.
will find that you have forgotten your place and your old family’. In Manichaean texts there appears to be a resultative present perfect with bol- in the preterite, where är- in the preterite would have given past perfect meaning: ymä agizlanmiš bolti [ulu]g ögrünçün, ymä bitil[miš] bolti ağır sâvinçin ‘and it has been pronounced with great joy and written down with overwhelming happiness’ (M I 25.3-5); sizlär anä üčün okımıš boltuqulalar (M III nr.7 III r5) ‘You have been called for that reason’.

Let us sum up what we have found to express tense and aspect in finite indicative non-evidential verb phrases. There are five simple forms: The imperfect aorist, the preterite, the perfect base -miš / -mAdOk, the future -dÆl / -mAÆl or -gAy and, in Uygar, the recent past -yOK and the imminent future in -gALIr. All these are also found transferred into the past by the preterite of the copula. -miš is in a special situation as it needs the pronoun ol or the form ärür for serving as predicative perfect verb form; without one of these it would be confused with its homophone expressing evidential past. Perfect -miš / -mAdOk is also unique among the simple verb forms in (at least once) getting coupled with ärgäy to express taxis, and also with bolti, bolur or bolgay to form verb phrases: -miš bolti was found to express a present perfect while -miš bolur and -miš bolgay give future perfect meaning.

3.27. Status and epistemic mood

Many languages of the world, among them modern and ancient languages of northern Eurasia including all the Turkic ones, possess a category which has been called ‘status’, expressing whether the information which the speaker / writer supplies to the addressee reached his (the speaker’s) consciousness directly or indirectly. The speaker / writer using a marked member of this category indicates the way by which the information reached his or her attention. This category should by no means be confused with epistemic modality, which expresses the speaker’s opinion on the reliability of the content of his utterance: The ‘status’ category does not itself say anything on reliability. There may, however, be some inferences in that direction on the part of the addressee (whether intended by the speaker / writer or not), which is

460 Concerning the translation of kişi as ‘family’ cf. my people ‘my family’ in spoken English. kişi ‘person’ with possessive suffix apparently also acquired the meaning ‘wife’, but that was probably a result of narrowing of the meaning ‘family’. Arabic âyût ‘family’ also came to mean ‘wife’ in many Turkic languages
why we are dealing with the two categories in the same section. We will first give a short account of status and then of epistemic modality as we find them realised in Old Turkic sources.

Old Turkic indirective status is normally expressed by the verb form ār-miš added to nominal or verbal sentences. When referring to past events, however, ārmiš is not added to preterite forms; instead, the verbal suffix -mlš (also serving the perfect participle, with which indirect status is related both by function and meaning) replaces the preterite element -d (+ possessive suffixes). In this, Old Turkic is similar, to Turkish, e.g., and (with some phonetic changes) to Yakut.

Status is not an obligatory category in Turkic, which means that the use of a directive form like -dl does not guarantee that the addressee has actually witnessed the unfolding event. When the content is negative, -mA-dOk is used in most of Old Turkic instead of -mlš; the use of -mA-mlš sets in only in rather late Old Turkic. The reasons for this suppletion may lie in content: Evidentiality is the perhaps oldest function of the finite -mlš form in this language, and an event which did not take place can have produced no evidence.

The contents of a message can be indirective in one of three ways, in Old Turkic as elsewhere: Most prominently in the Old Turkic documentation, a person or persons different from the speaker may be the source of the information being transmitted by the speaker, the so-called ‘reportive’ function; this may refer to matters placed in the past, the present or the future with respect to the speech act. Secondly, the speaker may have inferred the content of his utterance from some evidence forthcoming either during the occurrence of the event or, more commonly, surviving the event after it was completed. This ‘inferential’ or ‘evidential’ function has often been taken to be the central or at least the primary one as far as Turkic languages are concerned, as the -mlš form is also the perfect participle,\footnote{The identity of the two forms extends to the feature that both are, in Old Turkic, replaced by -mA-dOk when negated.} and as the perfect in fact sums up a wrapped-up event from the vantage point of its contribution to the present or to some other state following its completion. It is important to state straightway that Old Turkic -mlš cannot by itself be used as a finite perfect (or ‘postterminal’, to use Johanson’s clearer term). Thirdly there is the ‘mirative’ function of the indirective, where the speaker does, in fact, himself witness the event he is reporting on, but registers it with surprise, as his mind was not in any way prepared for this particular event. This is still indirective, in that reality in a sense belies the picture which the speaker / writer had made of it for himself, the
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former abruptly superimposing itself upon the latter. All uses of the
indirective essentially include implicit reference to a foreign view-
point, emanating from the event itself or from some other focus of
consciousness.

In öyträ nā har ārmīş tepān biltimiz, tāŋrīli yākli nādā ētō sıŋüşmīş, yaroklī karaľī kāltī katılmīş, yērīg tāŋrīg kīm yaratmış tepān biltimiz
(Xw 134-6) ‘we know what there was before ..., for what reason god
and demon fought, how light and darkness were mixed (and) who
created the earth and the sky’ the speakers do not (pretend to) have any
postterminal evidence for the contents of the subordinated sentences;
rather, they were told about it by others. Similarly in ...
bulmaţ ārmīş
tep sav āşiddī (Suv 621,20) ‘She heard the news that they were not
finding ...’, where the object proposition is verbal, with present taxis.
Cf. further edāŗīr ārmīş in az īnaru barm[iš], bir őgü[r] ām[y]gak
kör[miš], ymā məyɡag sıgünug uva[tı]se biļļig ücān edāŗīr ārmīş bo
bālgu körüp ymā ... īnėa tepān ārmīş (M I 35,7) ‘He went a bit further
and saw a herd of female maral deer. A female maral deer was pursuing
a male for sex. He saw this omen and ... asked as follows:’

When reportive -mIš appears in questions, the addressee is expected to
give a merely reportive answer, as in bo tīnīlglar nā ayīţ kīlīnč
kīlīmīşlar ārkī, kīm bo montag āşunta tugup ... (MaitH XX 1v20) ‘These
creatures, what sins are they said to have committed, that they are born
in such an existence and ...’. Reportive past perfect gives
-mIš ārmīş:
ænag æşīmīş bar: mahaprajaţapati gautami hatun ... tāpīnmiš
udunmiş ārmīş (tep) (MaitH III 1b17) ‘I have heard the following:
Queen Mahāprajāpāti Gautamī had done obeisance to ...’

The inscrptional sentence "karlok eşiş yă kālmādok" tedi. signifies
‘He said ’The K. are said not to have come for service”’, to judge by its
context. This is an example for the negative counterpart of inferential
-mIš: The Karlok are absent.

In the following example, on the other hand, ārmīş is added to the
predicative verb form to signal mirativity: ančama māţi, ančama őğdū
asģ tusu, ančama őğdū kūt kīv kīm māniş ővимtă barkīnta hurxanlīg
kīn tāŋrī tugar ārmīş (MaitH XI 3v11) ‘Such happiness, such good
favour, such good luck and blessing that – it turns out – sun-like
Buddha is being born in my home’. Similarly, the little mouse which
climbs on top of a pot in HTs VIII 391 and then says: sumer tąusaha
giţımak alp ārmăţ ārmīş ‘It turns out it isn’t difficult to climb mount
Sumeru’. Such surprise can also apply to the 1

\[462\] The editor here writes őkūl[š] ‘many’, which seems quite unlikely.
modern Turkic languages), e.g. in the following passage (U I 8-9, Magier): biz[i̇n̩] tapïngu yu̇kïng̩ ë̄rdi̇nī berïp ärmï̇s. biz tapïnguka tå̄gïmsiz ärmï̇s biz; bilmätï̄n kudūgï̄ kâmi̇smï̄s biz “It turns out that he has given us a jewel to worship (but we were unworthy of it). It turns out we are unworthy of worshipping (Jesus Christ); unwittingly, it appears, did we throw it (i.e. the stone which he gave us) into the well’. Little Jesus had given the three kings a stone which they had found too heavy to carry and, unaware of its value, had thrown it into a well, whereupon a blaze reaching all the way to the sky came out of the well. With nominal predicate we find amranmak nizyanî ât yedâçï̄ kan içdâçï̄ yâk içkâkïlrâðå ymå ustînrâk yavlað ärmï̄s (DKPAMPb 152) ‘The passion of lechery is – as I now see – worse than demons and vampires eating flesh and drinking blood’: The pupil discovers a ‘truth’ already known to his addressee who is his teacher. When saying bo nâ angâklik yer ärmï̄s (KP 4,8), for instance, the Good-thinking Prince expresses his surprise that the world, as he comes to discover it, turns out to be such a place full of suffering. The nominal sentence mân kololadokum kamagdâ ârkï̄lgï yultuz ärmï̄s (1.5-9 in ms. TM 342 = U 5) ‘What I have discovered is that stars turn out to be the mightiest’ has a sentence as comment (or ‘predicate’). This subordinated sentence is the result of the speaker’s observations, what he finds out and presents as their result, what has become evident to him but is not evident to his addressees. In HTs VII 199-201 the (in this case perhaps rhetorical) surprise appears to come by reading: [okîyū] tâgï̄ndîm tâ̄gï̄ri xanîmîz yaratmï̄s sudurlar şastrîrînî̄ş swî̄štâlgînî̄: yarumî̄s ol ôqrâkîlîrînî̄şdâ, ârmï̄s ol antîkîlîrînî̄şdâ ‘I have respectfully [read] the preface to the sûtras and šastras composed by our divine ruler: It turns out that it overshadows those of the previous ones (i.e. the previous authors) and surpasses those of the present ones’. This points at the pragmatic use to which mirativity is put.

Old Turkic clearly distinguishes between epistemic mood and what is conceived of or presented as (in)ability, unlike Western European languages which use the verb ‘can’ in both functions. In Old Turkic, (in)ability is expressed by the verb u-(ma-) and by verb phrases of the shape -U bol- and -gAll bol-; these do not serve epistemic mood. In this language, epistemic mood is communicated through other analytical verb constructions, through various simple verb forms and through particles.

There are two particles expressing the speaker / writer’s attitude towards the likelihood of the content of a proposition, both excellently
documented: ärki in the UW and ärinč e.g. in T. Tekin 2000: 161-162 for the inscriptional instances and the UW for the Uygur ones. Parts I and II of the UW entry for ärki deal with the interrogative uses of this particle, especially in the sections m) – o), which refer to nominal sentences and sentences with the aorist and the constative preterite; in section p), which documents uses of ärki with forms expressing the future, its meaning is mostly ‘hopefully’. The epistemic meaning of ärki can be translated to English as ‘clearly’ or ‘apparently’ or ‘perhaps’. ärinč, on the other hand, signifies ‘surely’, ‘probably’ or ‘no doubt’. Runiform instances accompany forms in -mIš (and its negative counterpart -mAdOk) or the preterite and there is one nominal sentence; Uygur also has, in addition to the mentioned verb forms, aorist and future instances. In all of these, ärinč is the last word of the sentence. This is often also the case with ärki; the rule for that, however, appears to be that it immediately follows the predicate or comment, whether that is at the end or not. lA, a particle which, according to DLT fol.538, was used by the Oguz, is assertive: See section 3.341 for it.

The verb bol- sometimes has a content which is marked within the epistemic category, when it signifies not ‘to become’ but ‘to tend to be’ or ‘to be expected to be’: thus in the sentence bramanlar kuvânçlıg bolurlar (TT X 474) ‘Brahmans are normally arrogant’. The sentence muntada ymä muğadinçlg nâgü bolgay (Mait 26 A r4) can be translated as ‘What could be more wondrous than this?’; this instance of bol- does not signify ‘to become’ either: The sentence amalgamates interrogative with dubitative content, the latter being expressed both by bol- and by the future form. In the following sentence we have the -sAr form, the most prominent function of which it is to form conditionals, used for expressing doubt, an epistemic content; the stem is again bol-: kim bolsar463 bo yer suvda ol tünını tüzü tüküti tüşin sözładacı (MaitH XI 3r13) ‘Who on this earth might it be who could fully express the import of that dream?’

In the Orkhon Turkic sentence Türk bodun, ölsüküŋ / ölsüküg (KT S6, S6-7 and N5) ‘Oh Turk nation, you are bound to die’, certainty about the future is expressed by a form consisting of the necessititative participle in -sxk together with the possessive suffix of the 2nd person referring to the subject.

The primary meaning of the -gUtäg construction discussed at the end of section 3.284 is to qualify an entity as ‘suitable for the activity

463 The second syllable of this word is quite unclear on the facs. and could in fact be -gay and not -sar. Q and S on the one hand, Y and R on the other, don’t look all too different and not much remains in the ms. anyway.
denoted by the verb’. In Middle Turkic and some Siberian Turkic languages it came to express conjectures and fears that the activity denoted by the verb would take place; an Uygur example for this meaning, which makes the construction relevant to epistemic modality, seems to appear in yetgü täg kālir oglanīg (BT XIII 2,44) which, in its context, signifies ‘(someone) could come and might lead the children off’.

Uygur has an analytical construction for expressing that the speaker considers the realisation of a certain proposition unlikely: The verb is put into a phrase of the shape -gU+sl yok, the subject staying in the nominative; e.g. ig toga ketgüsi yok (U I 45,4) ‘It is not expected that the illnesses will disappear’; mānīn köngülüm yûrûkîm [...] sintâdâ öği ketip bargüsi yok (TT X 466) ‘It is [quite] unlikely that my heart should abandon you’. sîg′gūsi yok ārdî ‘it could not be expected to fit in’ shows the same analytical construction transposed into the past. -gUlXk+I yok is used in the same way, e.g. in muntada yegüdp upút üstân bolgulukî yok (PañcÖlm 55) ‘There are no chances of them to prevail and overcome (them)’:

ärgây, the future form of the copula, may express presumption: amtī čaštanī elig kûzûnmâz bolup bardî; kalîn yâklûr tâgîrmîlâyîyî avlîp altîlîr ärgây (U IV A 233) ‘Now king Caștana has completely disappeared; the numerous demons have crowded around him and will have captured him’. Such a presumption can be linked with a rhetorical question, as in the following instance of direct speech: ay ulug elig bûg! mân montag montag sav âşidîm. bo nû sav ol? azu bizîy amîrâk ögökûmûz ây kîçîgi maha satvi464 içgûmûs ärgây mu bîz? (Suv 622,11) ‘O great king! I have heard such and such news. What matter is this? Might we possibly have lost Mahasattva, our dear beloved smallest one?’ Röhrborn (UW 402a, §18c of the entry for ār-) thinks these instances must be errors for ārki but it is not good philological practice to assume an error to have taken place over and again in the same word. A future form would not be unreasonable in view of the English translation, German ‘werden ihn gefangen genommen haben’ and Turkish ‘esir etmiş olacaklar’. See section 3.343 for a proposed connection between ärgây and ārki. The sentence munûy tûsûmiş tûllûrin kodaru kololaras mân otgûratî ordog karšîg kodup taşgaru şingây täg mân (MaitH XIII 4v7) signifies ‘If I deeply meditate on the dreams she dreamt, it looks as if I would definitely abandon the palace.

464 In his edition of this text, Kaya adds a g not found in the ms. to make this into an accusative form; this is not necessary as Old Turkic proper names used as direct objects can also be in the nominative case. The i is part of the name.
and go out’, where I have translated the postposition as ‘it looks as if’. The sequence -gU tāg discussed above also fused in Middle Turkic to give just this meaning, as does Khakas -gAdAg. The history of -gU tāg can be followed well through Middle Turkic, but by shape the Khakas form is actually closer to -gA(y) tāg than to -gU tāg.

The content of the forms in -yOk and -gAlIr (discussed in section 3.26) has some connection to epistemic mood, as they make the addressee look at events of the recent past and the imminent future respectively though their relevance for the moment of speaking, involving a special assertion that they are ‘real’.

3.28. The non-finite verb

Non-finite verb forms are either infinitives referring to non-factive action (section 3.281), converbs (section 3.286), imperfect participles (section 3.282), perfect participles (section 3.283) or projection participles (section 3.284). All participles can also refer to an action, event, state or process whereas infinitives cannot, inversely, refer to any participants in the action as participles do. The -gAlIr form, being difficult to classify, gets a section for its own (3.285). Infinitives and participles can either be used attributively or be nominalised (irrespective of whether they refer to participants or to actions etc.); when nominalised they show the category of case and can be governed by postpositions. Converbs can only be used adverbially and normally show no nominal behaviour; they do, however, sometimes get case suffixes and get governed by postpositions suitings their adverbial meaning: The expansion following the /p/ in -(X)pAn as compared with -(X)p could be related to the instrumental suffix and -mAItIn must have been expanded from Orkhon Turkic -mAItI with the help of this suffix; the vowel converb appears to be governed by the postposition birlā in a construction denoting action immediately preceding the action of the main verb and -gAll can be governed by the postposition üčün.

The border between participles and deverbal nominals (section 3.113 above) is a bit fuzzy, as different criteria are possible for the distinction, and these can lead to different classifications. One criterion for distinguishing the two is that the former are, like verbs, negated with -mA-. Another criterion is the degree of lexicalisation; but deverbal nominals are often not lexicalised either, although their creation belongs to word formation. A third criterion is whether the word qualifies the subject, object, etc. as a permanent characterisation or something which the participant is involved in temporarily; the former
is more nouny (and hence belongs more to word formation), the latter more verblike. This semantic-pragmatic distinction is not always easy to decide on even in context, and may not always have been meant to be clear-cut by the speaker/writer in the first place. The fourth criterion is government: In principle, verbs (including participles) govern direct and indirect objects while nouns don’t. In fact we find that a large group of forms consisting of deverbal nominals with the agentive nominal suffix +čč – and a few others as well – do govern objects, though by far not as extensively as participles. Old Turkic participles govern objects exactly as finite verbs do.

3.281. The infinitive

The form in -mAk, which denotes actions, events, states or processes, is not all too common in Old Turkic, as the normal verbal complement for verbs is the -gAlI converb and as participles can also refer to events or actions. The infinitive is closest to the projection participles discussed in section 3.284; it differs from them in that it refers only to events or actions, whereas -gU or -sXk forms can also refer to direct or indirect objects, to time or place and the like. Considering the following instance (from Wilkens / Zieme / Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 131) we note another difference between -mAk and the projection participles: üztüntän enip ölmüş üzüütüg ölmükü tirgürmüş tąğırın signifies ‘my lord, who revived from death (= from being dead) the soul which descended from above and died’; ol-gü-dâ would have signified ‘(saved) from dying’ and would not have been compatible with tirgür-.

There do not appear to be any negative infinitives in early texts. We have them e.g. in [subu]di ... öütünti ayüti [är]özüüt savıg köğülükki (BT I F47) ‘Subhūtī ... begged to ask about the non-creation of bodily matters in the heart’465 and idnamakığızların ötgüürü (Suv 671,15) ‘because you did not give up on it’; there are many more such forms in Suv.

We turn to the use of this form. In yeg bolgay arığda semǎkdâ yorîp otîn suvîn àtöz eltimmek (MaitH XX 13r11) we find an impersonal infinitive phrase as the topic of a nominal sentence; it signifies ‘It would be better if one lived in the forest, getting along with herbs and water’. While behaving like a verb within the phrase of which it is the kernel, the infinitive also shows nominal categories like case, the accusative in the example quoted. In the following instance it appears in the locative and governs an object: nom nomlamakta uz ... bolțîlar

---

465 The BT I instance must be late also because a parallel, otherwise identical passage (D 117-118) has a different formulation with a positive infinitive.
CHAPTER THREE

(HTs VIII 64) ‘They became masters at preaching’. In *alku ... ayig tütüš käriš karışmakig amîrtgurduči ärir* (U II 58,5) ‘They (are the ones who) pacify all quarrel and disagreement’ the infinitive is parallel to deverbal nouns and serves as direct object of another verb. Infinitives can qualify nouns, e.g. in *ulîmak şıghtamak ünlär* (MaitH XX 1r18) ‘voices of moaning and weeping’ or *öîlärnäk sakınči* (TT IV A 29) ‘with the intention of killing’; in the second instance quoted here, however, it qualifies another verbal abstract and is in fact its object.

Nominal subjects which accompany this form appear in the genitive or in the nominative. *ol orontakı alku tînlîgarınıń artokrak arıg sütük bolmaki bolur; tamuda tugdači tînlîgarınıń üzülmäki bolur* (U II 38,74-5) ‘There takes place the perfect purification of all creatures who are in that place and a stop to creatures destined to be born in hell’ is an example for the former; another one is *samtsco ačarinıń tavgac xan bîrlä käliš bariš bitig üdişmakın ukîtmak* ‘the description of the correspondence between Xuanzang and the Chinese emperor’, the title of a chapter in HTs, where Xuanzang is the subject of _üdişmak_. In *burxanlärınıń tînlîgarıq ädgü ögli köjülın ömäki ögniţta kaqmıta taki artok ućün* (Warnke 195) ‘because the Buddhas are well-meaningly considerate of the creatures even more than (their) mothers and fathers’ the infinitive, with genitive subject and accusative object of its own, is the topic of a nominal clause which, in turn, is subordinated by _üćün_.

With nominative subject we have *bökünki künkädiği mogočlar ootka tapinmak tîltäği bo ârir* ‘this is the reason for the Magi’s worship of fire to this day’ in Magier, U I 9. Other such instances are *biz bir ikinti bîrlä öçâsmaq kârgâk ârmâz* (Wettkampf 54) ‘There is no need for us to fight with each other’ or _cinäk kegińč bermåki nom* ‘the treatise of Ç.’s answer’, the title of a book in ChrManMsFr 1208. The first two quoted texts are Buddhist whereas the third is Christian and the fourth and fifth Manichæan. The case of the subject is crucial: The existence of nominative subjects shows that _-mAk_ is inflectional and not derivational while the existence of genitive subjects does not speak against this status.

An infinitive is governed by instrumental _üzä_ in “*kâl toyn!_*” _temâk üzä toyn kigüriup ...* (U III 75,2) ‘(Buddha) enlisted (them) as monks by saying ‘Come, *466 monk!’*. The sequence _-mAk ućün* ‘in order to’, so common in Turkish, seems to be rare in Old Turkic. We find it in *tägrikän uygur bokuk xan ... koyniyla üç maxistak olormak ućün mozagka kâjådi* ‘His Uyghur majesty Bokuk xan (came to Xoço and)

---

466 Or, if the first word is an Indo-Aryan noun, ‘(It is) time, monk!’.
consulted with the Možak in view of the taking of office of three Mahistaks in the year of the sheep in BuchFrag 1.1.2.7, a very early text. Note that the (nominative!) subjects of olor- here differ from the main subject.467

Reference to subjects can appear in the form of possessive suffixes added to the -mAk form, e.g. sūmakimiznī buzulmakimiznī tükörtülü umadımız ‘we couldn’t stop our heartbreaking’ (HTs VII 1916) or maŋa amrammakinįž (U III 29.1) ‘your love for me’. With the third person e.g. turkarū ögrünçün mānjūn ārmāki bolur (TT VI 101) ‘He enters a state of continuously living (or: dwelling there, i.e. in the house) in happiness’; DreiPrinz 121, an early Manichaean text, has -mAk+IrI bol-. kältıkımın kertiğünzün[lär], sizin bağǎdmakinįž(ın ārkłımakinįž(ın bilzün[lär]) (DreiPrinz 65-67) has the infinitive in a construction identical with the perfect participle in -gAlI and in parallel with it. ol ok künkâ ārtiŋū ögrünčülāsmāk kiltlär (DreiPrinz 109) ‘On that very day they had a lot of mutual rejoicing’ looks like a circumlocution for ‘ögrünčülāstlär’, perhaps copied from a source text.

Translating the instances we quoted, we used the English -ing form, abstracts such as the nouns stop, answer, love or worship or Latinate forms in -tion, -ence or -ment. The only case where we used the English infinitive was when mentioning the ‘need to fight’. What corresponds to the English infinitive is rather the converb in -gAlI or, in other types of cases, the projection participle in -gU. -mA is not a deverbal noun either, however, as it has full verbal government, can (on occasion) be negated with -mA-, can get nominative subjects and its forms are clearly not created for the lexicon. Unlike the English infinitive, it is not used adverbially. It is like the German infinitive or the Semitic maśdar when getting accompanied by its subject in the genitive but unlike them when the subject is in the nominative.

The form -mAk+IrG, appearing rather extensively in adnominal function, is discussed in OTWF 154-155 and in section 4.61 below.

467 The reading āmgāk āmgādi bizni kwadm[aj] uči[n, in a passage in P. Zieme, ‘Das nestorianische Glaubensbekenntnis in einem alttürkischen Fragment aus Bulayiq’, UAJbN.F. 15 (1997/8): 173-180, has no certainty, as the facs. shows that the lacuna could have contained much more than two letters. In itself such a phrase would not be surprising in a ms. dated by the editor to the 13th-14th century, which shows kutar- < kutgar- and metatheses such as nǐ > ń[ and yr > ry. The reading āmgāndi, which the editor here proposes (against his reading āmgādī in his quote from the ms. in 1974), is possible in view of the fact that the base verb is otherwise not attested in Uygur although there is only one N 1 ‘; I do not think it is obligatory, however, as āmgā- is attested in Qarakhanid Turkic, and the text does have the aberrant feature of writing the ablative form in +dAn several times instead of classical +dIn.
-mAksXz, which is just as common, is dealt with in OTWF section 3.329. -mak with possessive suffixes referring to the subject of the action and in the dative case is used in temporal clauses (section 4.633) or can give instrumental meaning.

3.282. Imperfect participles
Participles are verbal adjectives which, like other adjectives, readily assume nominal tasks, i.e. they can be heads of noun phrases. I here deal with participles under the headings ‘imperfect’, ‘perfect’ (section 3.283) and ‘projection’ (section 3.284); these are meant to be very wide labels, as the forms dealt with in section 3.283 do not necessarily have ‘perfect’ aspectual meaning, and the ‘projection’ in section 3.284 can mean many different things.

Imperfect participles turn out mostly to qualify nominals referring to subjects, or themselves to refer to subjects of actions expressed by the verbal base. They are only very rarely used for qualifying non-subjects; when they are, there is no explicit or implicit reference to the subject linked to them.\footnote{The use to which the Suv puts forms in -guêl is an exception: Those do get accompanied by explicit subjects.} The perfect participles of section 3.283 regularly refer to non-subject participants, e.g. to direct or indirect objects, and to circumstantial entities; only rarely do they qualify subjects. Projection participles, dealt with in section 3.284,\footnote{Another question, of course, is whether the present participle in -daël and the future suffix -daël should not (when disregarding diachrony) be considered to be mere homophones.} never qualify the subjects of their bases. All participles can also refer to actions, events, processes or states, in accordance with the fact that an Old Turkic adjective can, beside qualifying or denoting an entity bearing a particular quality, also be used for referring to the abstract quality as such. When serving as predicates, participles demand no copula, but the element ol may be used after them in such cases.

Imperfect participles are used as finite predicates to different degrees:
- -Ur is used much more often in such function than as participle and
- -daël is used in this way mainly in the runiform inscriptions.\footnote{On the other hand, we have come across only one instance of -(X)gll in predicative use and -(X)gma is never used in this way. -gAn and -guêl forms are, in Old Turkic, even farther from finite use.} On the other hand, we have come across only one instance of -(X)gll in predicative use and -(X)gma is never used in this way. -gAn and -guêl forms are, in Old Turkic, even farther from finite use.

The suffix -(X)gma forms positive imperfect participles: Negative forms are not attested; this may be a sign of reduced productivity:
-mAdAcI and –mAgUeCL, e.g., are common. Nor do -(X)gmA forms ever appear to be used predicatively; examples are heads or attributes. A number of Orkhon Turkic examples are quoted in Tekin 1968: 176; we also have är-igmä in QaraBalş 5, a runiform inscription of the Uygur steppe empire. The form is rather common in Manichaean sources, e.g. iki yarok ordo içrä olorugma täyrilär (Xw 40-41 and 52-53) ‘the gods residing in the two palaces of light’; tört elig täyrilärädä tanigmalar, täyri nomın tutagmalar, tünärig yüklärkä tapunagmalar, tümnänlik erinçü kiligmalar (M II 11.5-8) ‘those who deny the existence of the four ruling gods, disregarde divine law, worship murky demons, commit sins by the ten thousands’. Cf. further yerdä ýorıgma yalanık ‘people living on earth’.

Substantivised we have, e.g., bo ... agramu yatagma ‘this (person) lying (there) wretching’ (ManErz I 6); several further examples appear in the Xw. Substantivised -(X)gmA forms can, of course, also get case suffixes and +lAr, e.g. in nomči män tegmäkä artizıp ... ‘getting (oneself) deceived by those who say ‘I am a preacher’ (Xw 122); there are further such examples in IrqB XX or HTs Biogr 135.

As pointed out in UW 429b (where examples of är-igmä are mentioned), the Uygur use of this participle is productive only in Manichaean texts;470 Buddhist sources only have petrified forms from the verbs är- ‘to be’, käl- ‘to come’, te- ‘to say’ and uč- (because of učugma ‘flying’ qualifying ‘creature’ and referring to birds). The Mait has the forms kāligmä and ärigmä, the latter e.g. in täyri yerintä ärigmä täyrilär (Mait 103v5) ‘the gods staying in the divine country’. Another set phrase which stayed in use in later Uygur is ken kāligmä id ‘the future’ (e.g. BT II 141).

te-gmä is the only -(X)gmA form used for qualifying the verb’s object; we have it e.g. in darrı te-gmä kapıp ‘the gate called dhāraṇī’ (Suv 457,4 and BT II 1077), činžu tegmä ārtokkāg kertı töz bälgüşi ‘the mark of the so-being true root called tathatā’ (TT VI 190), bo yerinticidäki kanag eliglär kanlar tegmä ıküsü bodisatyldar tettır (TT VI 248) ‘most of those called kings and rulers in this world are considered to be bodhisattvas’ and several more in that text. This use is very common in Buddhist texts (including early ones like TT VI) but seems to appear only in them. Possessive suffixes referring to subjects are never appended to -(X)gmA forms.

470 The word read as y(a)rlikagma in M III nr.9 II,1 r9 is now by P.Zieme (personal communication) seen to be yalvarar m(a)n.
-Ur (negated as -mAç) is much more common in predicative verb forms than as a participle suffix. Examples for its use as participle are uyakur yultuzlar (Mait) ‘setting stars’, akıp (or ağıp) kâlir sogik suv (TT I 104) ‘cold water flowing forth (or coming up)’, nom bilir är (KP 14,3) ‘a person who knows the doctrine’, bilîg bîlmäz kişi (KT S 7) ‘an ignorant person’, tayş anvu ögäsi bilgäsi tetir ârklig (Mz 711 lines 32-33 quoted in TenKings, 6th and 7th court) ‘the mighty one called minister and counsellor of Taishanfu’, körür kürüm körmäz tâg, bilîr biligim bîlmäz tâg boltî (KT N 10) ‘My (normally) seeing eyes seemed as if they had lost their sight and my (otherwise) thinking mind seemed to have lost its senses’ shows the form as a nominal governed by a postposition. yazmas atîm ‘a marksman who does not miss’ in DLT fols.470 and 610 is a negative adnominal instance; note that both DLT passages show it in proverbs.

In early texts the participial use of the aorist is not limited to agentive heads: The head of yanmas yerdâ oztumuz (M III nr.16 v3) ‘We escaped the place of no return’ is the source of the movement described by the verb, the place from which no creatures come back. Nor is bo tugar ôlür yertincü yersuv (BT V 866-7; Wilkens 170) ‘this world where one gets born and dies’ agentive; in this instance the head refers to the place where birth and death takes place continuously. Cf. tugar ôlür sansar in AranemiZieme 88. In yeltirär a y (Windg 17), literally ‘the month (in) which (the wind) blows’, the head refers to the time frame. The verbs have neither explicit nor implicit subjects in any of these instances, so that no agentive possessive suffixes are necessary.

471 The form is irregular in that the suffix is in Old Turkic otherwise -mAç and not -mAš, and an early source would not confuse voiced and voiceless consonants. The ms. is now lost. -mAš would not fit the context very well (though i is sometimes written with alef). Qarakhanid sources also have -mAš although they do not confuse the velars either; the text may therefore belong to a different dialect.
472 “Windiger Monat” in UW 380. A literal German translation would be ‘der Monat in dem es weht’, ‘wehen’ (unlike ‘to blow’) being a verb which always has the wind as subject. Various Asiatic nature calendars have a month named ‘windy month’. Zie me, who last edited the fragment in BT XIX 186-189, translated this expression as ‘antreibender Monat’, taking the verb to be the causative of yäl- ‘to trot, to amble’. There are three problems with his interpretation, adopted from EDPT 923b: Firstly, YYLYYRR differs from yäl-tür-är in all three vowels, the aorist vowel of yeltir- ‘to blow’ always being /â/. Secondly, the earliest certain instances of yältür- are from the 15th century; it does not appear to have turned up in Uygur and a different reading is just as possible for the Tuń word referred to in the EDPT entry. Thirdly, the Tuń and Ottoman instances referred to in the EDPT are about ‘riding fast’; the Tarama Sözleþi also confuses the semantically and syntactically distinct Ottoman verbs yâldür- and yeldîr-. See section 4.612 for the frame sentence.
either on the head or on the participles. In MaitH Y 243 which, unlike the previous instances, is Buddhist, the head (ig) is the cause of the (averted) event (öl-); it (and not the satellite) is marked with a possessive suffix referring to the person who might have died: purani atlag tirtılär baxšișin ... vişiçik atlıq olur iqintä ozguru yarlıkadi ‘He graciously saved Pûraṇa, the heretics teacher, from his deadly illness called vişiçikä’.

The -Ur form is also governed by ärkän (runiform inscriptions) or ärkli (the rest of Old Turkeic) to form the kernel of temporal clauses. The following sentence shows it in three different functions, governed by ärkän, qualifying a head referring to time, and governed by a postposition: kaltï mân öğrä uzun asaŋkilig yolda bodisatvlar yorïkïnda yörüyur ärkän burxan kutïņa katïğlanur ugruda kalïl alp är çäriğkâ tâçtä isïg öçümin ösärkänësizïn tîtip idalâq bo montag susançmïc nam ärdinig boşgundum tutum (Suv 395,4-10) ‘While I was previously walking on the bodhisattvas’ path along the world-age-long road and at a time when I was striving towards buddhahood I grudgelessly gave up my life as, for instance, a valiant man goes to the army, and learned and kept this treasure of a sättra which is lovely to such an extent’.

The -(X)glI participle is mostly used in Manichæan sources and found also in two Yenisey inscriptions but is not too common in Buddhist Uygur. yalüglï yaşïn tâçri (M I 25,33) ‘the goddess of flashing lightning’ is an instance with an intransitive verb; üzütlärig udguruglï, köçûlüg äçëglï ymä kökçzüg yarotuglï ... tîris Öz berïlgï ... bilgä bilig (M I 26,12-17) ‘wisdom, which awakens the souls, opens the heart, brightens up the breast ... gives life’ has transitive -(X)glI forms which govern objects. In M III nr.12 r3 we find a negated -(X)glI form: üc yäg (thus!) savïn şimağlï ... täs azag nomlaglar ‘the ... propounders of heretic doctrines, who do not contradict the words of the three demons’. Buddhist examples appear in Fedakâr 135 (Sogdian script)

---

473 Some further examples: oçëglï üntâçli tâçri ‘the calling god’, buzüglï artâçli ‘destroying’ (ms. T I D 200 in the n. to TT V A 23); azüldaçi [çâ] mâqä ol tegli bûçljlar (HTs VII 1952) ‘writings saying ’it is perishable’ or ’it is eternal’”, açaçka tuçglï bursay ‘the congregation meeting the master’ (HTs III 377), bodisâvtnï kalzüsin küldügü ketumati känt ulüsâtki bodun bukan (Mait 146r5) ‘the population of Ketumati, which was expecting the arrival of the bodhisattva’. tuç tuçglï is a common attributive phrase for Buddha, e.g. in Mait 197r4. In TT VI 153 yokag biligï ‘a person knowing nothingness’ is, in half of the ms., replaced by yokag bilir.

474 This fragment in Manichæan script (Wilkens 127) must be rather late, as it confuses voiced and unvoiced consonants (e.g. yäg for yâk, b(ä)grü for bàkâr ‘firm’, totoru for tod-ur-a ‘to satiate’) and has some other errors.
and e.g. in VimalaZieme 1080 and 1081. Kāšgarī fo15 82-3 lists a number of participles, then says that all are negated like togra-ma-dači and yüklä-mä-dači and adds that, “in another dialect they say togra-ma-glī and yüklä-mä-glī”. The -(X)glI form was still in use in Middle Turkic (Ata 2002: 88).

Substantivized -(X)glI forms refer to the subject of the action, e.g., kiši āt’özün buluğlī antag ol ... üč yavlak yolkı tüşüglı anča ol ‘Those who attain human bodies are like ... (but) those who fall into the three evil ways are as ...’ (TT VI 336-7); bayın barınlūğin ... kavișiğlī az ārūr, yok ēğiyl bolup ... bariğlī olūglī āķiš ‘those who come together again under eased circumstances are few; those who become poor, leave and die are numerous’ (TT VI 314-5). The sentence ākıš tınılglar barıp olūglī ‘many creatures go there and die’ in KP 26,7 is similar, but here the -(X)glI form is predicative. In tana muna yörğılłar bar (Mait 165v23) ‘there are people who live unaware of what they say and do’ (and in another instance in Mait 83v29) we find the form in the plural. ikint[i] käßiglika tarak berg[āy] män ‘To the one coming second I will give the staff’ (DreiPrinz 28) and ićiğliği yaraşi sâviglig bolur (Windg + U132c 42) ‘it becomes agreeable to whoever drinks it’ are among the rare examples of the -(X)glI suffix with an oblique case form.

The phrases ādıgü oglı ‘well thinking, kind, compassionate’, avyq oglı ‘evil meaning (person), enemy’ and köni tüz tuyuğlı ‘he who senses rightly and evenly’ are lexicalised and are used unusually often, e.g. in KP and Mait. This is why we find ādıgü oÖglīlär ‘my friends’ or, in Suv, avyq or ādıgü oglılär-kå, oglılär-kå, oglı-m and oglı-sin; similarly with the third phrase. The UW (353-355) treats ādıgü oglı as a lexicalised phrase, mentioning that F.W.K. Müller already pointed out that it was a loan translation from a Sogdian term lexicalised already in that language. oglı is the only -(X)glI form attested in the Hami ms. of Mait; where the Sängim ms. has such forms they are, in the Hami ms., replaced by -(d)āčI or -(g)ēčI forms.

-(X)glI participles generally have intra-terminal meaning. The only possible exception I have met is barma yil anātkādqin käßigli arkiştın darmaguptakī ... baxšınnî kiyiltī aşidip ‘last year (we) heard from the messenger coming from India that our ... teacher Dharmaguptaka had

---

475 In OTWF a form ending in -(X)glXg (< -(X)g+lXg) and functioning a bit like a participle is documented; though it may live on in Turkish -(I)lI, it does not seem to be the source of the Middle Turkic forms.

476 In the n. to this passage, Hamilton states that this participle refers to actions reoccurring constantly. Such an interpretation is possible for many of the examples, but not, e.g., for the one in HTs VII 1913.
died’ (HTs VII 1913), where the time reference is past and the messenger must have given the news after he arrived: kâl-igli should therefore here have post-terminal meaning, unless there is reference to regular messenger service; the meaning should then not be ‘the messenger who came from India’ but ‘the messenger who comes from India’; this would be possible even if it were not the same person every time.

The -(X)glI participle is obsolete in inscriptive Turkic, where we only have the clearly petrified ârkli477 ‘being’. In yuyka ârkli tupulgâli učuz ârmîk; yinêgä ârklî ûzgâlî učuz (Tuñ 13) ‘It is easy to pierce what is thin, they say, and easy to break what is fine’. The form ârklî+g just quoted shows that ârkî is also a participle and not a converb. Nor had it, at that stage, become a postposition as yet, since postpositions do not feature actant case morphology.478 In other examples quoted in section 4.633, ârkî is added to -Ur participles from intransitive verbs to form an analytical temporal adjunct describing resultative states. What I here, following Tekin 1968, read as ârkî is spelled as r’k’gI, its accusative form as r’k’g. Thomsen and Gabain had read it as ‘ärkî’. Schulz 1978: 192-205 attacked both readings and the connection with the participle suffix -(X)glI; he instead suggested reading the form as ‘ärkâlî’ (following Aalto, an editor of the Tuñ inscription) and deriving the suffix both of this and of ârkân from some mysterious element -kä or -gä which he was unable to explain. r’k’g, again, was considered to be some remnant of unexplained archaic morphology. One of Schulz’s motives for this proposal, that the participle clearly has a /g/ (as shown in the spelling with Manichæan letters in Xw 117; l.127 of the relevant ms.) while ârkî is spelled with k’, is not so serious; cf. footn.477. The central argument for his attack is the fact that the ârkî constructions are adjunct clauses whereas -(X)glI forms participles which never serve as adjuncts. I would not consider this to be a serious problem either (beside the fact that the Tuñ inscription twice uses ârkî

---

477 In runiform inscriptions /g/ is spelled with k’ after r I n/, presumably to show that it is a stop in this position. For this contact between the two elements to take place, the onset vowel of the suffix must first have been elided, which it does not do e.g. in the form berigî quoted above, nor in âr-igî in the Uygur example mentioned further on. There is no phonotactic reason why it shouldn’t, especially if we decide that the velar in ârkî is not only a stop but also voiceless (that it should, in other words, be assigned to the phoneme /k/), as /hk/ is a sequence well-attested in syllable-final position.

478 Adjuncts, including postpositions, do get instrumental and equative case suffixes in âsmû+cî, âznî+cî, ânî+n and bîrlî+n, dealt with in section 3.3. These suffixes serve to make the adverbial status of these elements explicit, however, and do not assign participant tasks to them.
as headless participle, once in the accusative case): Forms of the copula in many languages develop special uses, Turkish ol-arak ‘as’ being one example for such a special use. Translating ärkli with the German and English participle forms ‘seiend’ and ‘being’ will easily show that the participles of these languages can also be used in ‘absolute’ manner, i.e. as adjuncts. All this could equally hold for Uygur ärkän, prominent in Schulz’s argumentation, which OTWF 383 had considered to be a remnant of the -gAn participle obsolete in most of Old Turkic though so active in the modern languages:479 There, again, it would only be normal for an obsolete form to have survived in the copula, and with an aberrant function. The reading of the Tuñ instances of ärkli and their interpretation as participles is unproblematic on the one hand, and cannot, on the other hand, be separated from the other inscriptional instances spelled in this way. T. Tekin’s understanding of the forms must therefore be correct.

In the following example the -(X)gI form has been taken to qualify a head which is not a subject, something for which I have found no parallel: böğü xan kantü [dîndar]lar ärigli kuvraggaru kälti, d[e]ndarl[ka] söküdü ... (TT II,1 34), translated ‘Böğü Qan kam seinerseits zu der Versammlung, wo die Elekten waren, und vor den Elekten auf die Knie fallend ...’: [dîndar]lar may, however, be a wrong conjecture;480 it seems likelier to me that we might have had the same construction as in Orkhon Turkic, with an -Ur participle before ärigli = ärkli, giving ‘B. khan came towards the assembly himself being [adjective], knelt [before] the elect and ...’. Note, on the other hand, that this is a Manichaean text and that the use of the aorist to qualify circumstantial heads is also a Manichaean characteristic.

The participle suffix -(X)gI1 is in runiform sources spelled with t1 / t2 in ölältäči and kältäči, in both cases because of the /l/. In Manichaean sources T appears in hoşantäči, kartultači, tapıntači, sakıntači, kıltači, börtäči, but also in kımüştäči in fragmentary context; on the other hand we find tâgûrdäči in M I 26,17-18. This list excludes the late Pothi book and TT IX, which do not follow the early rule of spelling suffix-onset /d/ as T after /r l n/. I have come across one (adnominal) -(X)gI

479 The etymology suggested for ärkän by Erdal 1991 was severely criticised by Johanson 1994 but adopted by Johanson 1996: 91, subsequently to be rejected again (oral communication). It may, instead, come from *ärür kän, with a particle discussed in section 3.341, in case the temporal suffix -mAzkAn dealt with in section 4.633 is formed with this particle.

480 The editors mark the l as well as uncertain.
form also in the (runiform) Yenisey inscriptions, in YE 28.9: *altun Soňa yiš käyïki arqïl tâşgil; aṭa-dači Upa Barsïm adrilu bardï* ‘Oh animals of the wooded mountain of Soňa, multiply and flow over; my hunting Upa Bars has died’. This instance is clearly imperfective although it refers to the past. In the Orkhon inscriptions, *-dÄčI* serves in positive finite verb phrases with future meaning (see section 3.26). That group of sources also shows this form in participial function with future reference, e.g. in *ölätäči boðunug türägeäği ìgßïl (KT E 29, BQ E 23) ‘I revived a dying nation (or ‘a nation about to die’) and took care of it’. Nominalised, *ükïš öltäči anta tïrïldä* ‘Many who were about to die were saved there’ (BQ E 31). The instance in *e ki iç bïń sümïz kêtäçïmiz bär mu nå* (Tuñ 14) can, in its context, refer either to the present or the future; it should mean ‘We presumably have two to three thousand soldiers, including the ones who are coming / about to come’.

The KT and BQ instances just quoted show clearly that Orkhon Turkic *-dÄčI* forms are not factive; their use differs from that of inscriptional *-sxk* participles (section 3.284) in that the former qualify or refer to subjects (in accordance with the normal behaviour of the other imperfective participles), the latter to all other participants in the action but not to subjects.

In Classical and Late Uygur as well as in Qarakhanid, the *-dÄčI* suffix forms present participles, replacing the participle suffixes mentioned above, most of which are typical for pre-classical sources: *bo nom ärdînïg bošgunačï tutdači tört tôrlüg terïn kuðrag* (Suv 423,16), e.g., is ‘the four types of communities which believe in this jewel of a doctrine and adhere to it’. *Tuttačï* is attested also in the QB. Further examples are *okordačï (U I 15), turkaru katïgliðandačï bodisatv* ‘the bodhisattva who is continuously exerting himself’ (U I 17,3). In Uygur, the negative counterpart of participial *-dÄčI* is *-mÄdÄčI*, e.g. [siz]ni ayañ keymekäči agïrlamadačï yok (HTs V 42) ‘There is nobody who does not honour you’. Similarly, *sävëmäçïci idï yok* ‘there is nobody who doesn’t love’ in Suv 579,12, *nomlarnï așïmekïn koramâkïn körümäcičï* ‘he who does not see the increase and the decrease of the teachings’ in 245,17. A *-mÄdÄčI* form in adnominal use: *tugmak olmäk sansar içintä tâşginïrdïčïci, ämgäçlik tâşginïçïlïn tâşgarï ìdmadačï igïd âzüg adkangelar* ‘the deceitful and false bonds which make (the creatures) revolve in the sansära of birth and death and do not let them out from the whirlpool of suffering’ (Suv 305,1). Further examples are *bolmaðci* in BT II 667 and 1030, *itürmäâci* ‘he who does not lose’ in BT II 718 or *üz mâðci* *käsmäâci* in BT VIII B 253; timeless (i.e. presentive) *-mÄdÄčI* forms are very common in Uygur. While finite
-dÄ¢l, which refers to the future, often had -mÄ¢l as negative counterpart, there is no evidence for -mÄ¢l as present participle suffix.

ä'tözüg talgokläkiči tamu (BT II 551-2) is the hell where the devils employed there nail a person’s body onto things. The head of this relativisation therefore represents the place of action; the expression could also be understood to say that this is the ‘hell which nails bodies (onto objects)’ if there is no other documentation for heads of -dÄ¢l referring to place. tamu is, however, unlikely to be the subject.

UW 404 lists numerous examples of verb phrases in -dÄ¢l ärür / ärmänz, -dÄ¢l ärti, -dÄ¢l ärmiş, -dÄ¢l ärsät, -dÄ¢l ärip and -dÄ¢l ärmädin. as if these were analytical constructions. The meanings of these sequences can, however, generally be distinguished from the corresponding simple forms: Sew Keytä ulation közgäšçi, kördäçi, užiklarğ ornatdaçi ärdilär (HTs VIII 1507), e.g., should not, presumably, be translated as “Xiao Jing ... and the übrigen Begs revidierten und prüften [den Text] und plazierten die Zeichen ...” but ‘The lords Xiao Jing etc. were in charge of collating and controlling (the text) and placing the letters’: The formulation describes the division of labor and is not identical to the description of processes. Similarly anin öc ätöçlärin ölörgökä bolar sizin ütinüzi näriğiçi ärttäçi ärrürär (TT VIII N 10), which Hartmann and Maue in their reeditio (Mär 78) translate as “darum übertreten [die Toren] Eure Anweisung, dadurch, daß sie sich selbst töten”. What is presumably meant is not a characterisation of acts, but a characterisation of a set of people committing these acts as sinners.

-gAn has wide-ranging and highly important functions in modern Turkic languages but was rather obsolescent in Old Turkic. It is dealt with in detail in OTWF section 3.324, as a number of -gAn forms got lexicalised; cf. also section 3.113 above: Some of the instances mentioned there may in fact belong here. OTWF 386-387 also refers to a number of -gAn forms, both in Old Uygur and in Qaraqhanid, where it is used as a part of the verbal system, as a habitual participle; we especially note the sequence -gAn bol-. Käšgarî says that the form denotes duration, continuity, habituality and/or frequent occurrence of an action; this is also how he translates the numerous examples which he mentions. Käšgarî’s -gAn forms govern direct and indirect objects quite freely, although the fact that he lists the instances at all must have meant that he thought the form belonged to the lexicon and not to inflection; all of them refer to the subject of the verb. Some of the Uygur examples are late (such as were edited in TT VII and ETŞ, e.g.
12.6 or 30.9-10) but kalîn kuvragag yet<î>gän uduzgan buyruklar ‘the commanders leading the dense crowd’ (MaitH XVI 9r28-29), e.g., is quite early and also shows the forms to have verbal government. In atamnîn mapa ülûštä täggän Taynsarågäki... borlukta ‘in the vineyard in T., which I got as my share from the inheritance of my father’, which appears in a late legal document (AmongUigDocc 3 = Sa11,3 in SammlUigKontr 2), the form is not habitual, i.e. it does not describe any quality of its subject, but is used as perfect participle. Another late economical document again has -gAn in perfect use, qualifying the verb’s object: inäcînîn sañka udeqgan üç [k]üri ü’rni... altım ‘I have received three bushels of millet which Inäcî poured into the barn’ (Mi15,2, same collection).

-gAn apparently came to refer to the action in the aberrant dialect of the fragments in Sogdian script: We find / ketårîn kim [... ]K ölgändä kurtul[ (AlttüSogd 415), where +dA is caused by verbal government: The meaning may have been ‘do away with ..., so that (we, they etc.) may be saved from dying’. In this instance, -gAn is neither perfective nor future, in agreement with its other uses.

Negative adnominal participles from the forms mentioned appear to have been rare: With -(X)gmA and -gAn none appear to be attested. Adnominal -mA is, of course, attested already in the KT inscription and -mA-glI in an early Manichaean source but ‘normal’ Uygur apparently did not make active use of these forms in the agentive domain. What became more and more normal was -mAAdåç: -mAksXz (dealt with in OTWF 3.329) appears to have been used extensively as habitual negative imperfective participle at the classical and post-classical stage. It had free verbal government; a majority of the instances appears to have been created for the passages in which they occur, i.e not to be lexicalised. -mAksXz was often formed from secondary stems, including the passive; this is why it did not need to qualify its object: When the head was an object, the attributive verb form was derived from the passive counterpart.

The formation with -gUçI consists of +çI added to -gU (section 3.284 below). It can be negated with -mA-: köni kertü sözlümägüçü kîši alka tanularnîn üldîşü bûltur ‘The fate of a person who does not say the truth is (to suffer in) all the hells’ (DKPAMPb 279-80, alternating with çerülgägüçü ‘telling lies’ in 1.281); adaşîn eșiñ mään tep rîşîn sözlü[ph] sâcrişiçiñ kîlmadîn utru sëvitin u[tîn] bilmägüçü bolsar ... (UV IV D 64) ‘(Whoever) says ‘I am your friend and companion’ with his tongue but
does not act in accordance with his words and is ungrateful, ... ;

481 tsuy ayîg kilînc kilîp ökînc köîncül örmügïçîlîr (MaîtH XXIII 9v2) ‘those that have committed sins secretly and have not repented’. The form can govern converbs, as in the example quoted last. Both köînc körtü sêzîlêmügïçî and sâvinê ulî bilmügïçî are presumably meant to denote character traits. We have an early instance of a -gîûêî form as head of a relative clause: kunçûylar taysîlar bašlagüçî [u]lug kîçêg kam(a)g bodun (TT II,1 64) ‘the whole nation, both big and small, led by princes and princes’; instances of headless and headed relativisation are quoted above. -gîûêî forms govern objects, as in TT IV A 56-61: toçuçê baltîçê käyîkê ângê þûaçê boltumuz ârsâr, torçê çâvçâçê kuçê edarçê, uçûgma, bàgrûn yorîgma þînl(i)glarîg olûrgüçî boltumuz ârsâr, it âtîn satsuçê boltumuz ârsâr, âçakrâm yîlan olûrgüçî boltumuz ârsâr, lue întûrgüçî yadêçê boltumuz ârsâr, [þînlîg]lariq kînagüçê bûkagüçê boltumuz ârsâr, ... 482 ‘If we have been hunters of wild boars, fishermen, wild game hunters, trappers, if we have been netters, bird-snarers, wild-fowlers or trackers who kill flying and crawling creatures, if we have been sellers of dog meat, if we have been killers of boa snakes, if we have been snake charmers or rain-stone magicians, if we have been jailers who torture people, ...’. On the other hand we note in this passage that, from the actionality point of view, -gîûêî is the verbal counterpart of +êî; both denote professions or people’s characteristics: None of the eleven -gîûêî forms quoted refers to an event, as verb forms are expected to do; all characterize people by their occupations, by social position, by recurrent behaviour or by psychological traits. By formal characteristics, however, this is a participle. The -gîûêî forms in KT N 13 already show this behaviour; they govern direct objects and refer to professionals: bärk egtîçê, bûdiz yaraîgma bîtîq tâş egtîçê tâlçaç xagan âkanî çan sängün kûltî ‘There came an architect, (and there also came) the sculptor General Chang, the nephew of the Chinese emperor, who creates the ornaments’. Being a sculptor was clearly the imperial nephew’s vocation, whereas bûdiz yaraîgma refers to his actual work on Köl Tegê’s grave (and ‘general’ is his title). In Uygur we have e.g. of vegüçî þînl(i)g (UigPañc) ‘a herbivorous creature’. In nominal use: k’âyntî bargey kumuka udu elkay berguçîg (M III 29, Nr.12 r 7) ‘He himself will go to hell and will take the donor after him’;

481 The phrase sâvinê ulî bil- ‘to be grateful’ appears also in lines 38 and 57 of the same passage and sâvinêçê is ‘ungrateful’.

482 A very similar confession in U II 84-85 adds two further -gîûêî forms, among them another one with direct object: umagüçê boltum âmûr, kûî olûrgüçê çansî boltum ârsâr ‘if I became a torturer, if I became an executioner killing people’.
in M III Nr.7 II r 5 the king’s clothes are washed by an uz yuguči a ‘master washer’. In KIP 4a a bodhisattva gets the name ün āşikgüči ‘the one hearing voices’. When Bögü Xan decides to adopt Manichaeism for his people the Uygurs, he appoints some persons to the administrative position of sāvatāguči (TT II,1 93): They get the task of urging the population to carry out pious deeds. Here is an equally agentive instance with direct object: kayu nomčilar bo altun önlüg y(a)roku yaltriklig kopda köprülmüş nom ārdinig nomlaguči ārsar … (Suv 474,1) ‘Whichever preachers occupy themselves with preaching this golden, radiant all-surpassing jewel of a text …’. Persons involved in transactions are also referred to with -gŪčI forms: algučka bergüčiḵā ayitıp (Acte 35,18) signifies ‘asking the buyer and the seller’ and ēamlagüči kìšǐ … korlug bolzun (Yamada, Slaves 198,22-23) ‘The person lodging an objection shall be responsible for any loss’.

A -gŪčI form qualifying its object, thus no longer being agentive, is sampar ačarā kālīrguči bawxanlar bitiğlar (HTs VII 1119) ‘the Buddha figures and books which Xuantsang brought along’. The Suv has many such examples: ol künki bizığ ašda ölīrguči u d köynıŋız bāşılāq tīnliğlar (Suv 6,13) ‘creatures, mainly bovines, sheep and pork, which we slaughtered on that day at our meal’. tükāl bilgā t(a)yrī t(a)yrkī bawxan y(a)rlıkgaguçı bo bodı tegmā yorık (Suv 379,9) ‘this path called bodhī which Buddha, the perfectly wise god of gods, teaches / taught’; birık eliğlır xanlar k(a)ltı t(a)yrım siz y(a)rlıkgaguçi bo töröča avrilıp … bo nom ārdinig āšıdsărılār (Suv 423,13; similarly 436,21) ‘if kings and rulers should, however, live according to the teaching which you, my lord, propound (= yarlıkgagući), and … listen to this jewel of a doctrine’. Another -gŪčI form qualifying the verb’s object appears in a Mz (i.e. earlier) ms. version of Suv 189,13 but is replaced by the -dāčI form in the much later Petersburg ms. These instances do not refer to persons by their occupations or characteristic behaviour, as agentive -gŪčI forms do.

3.283. Perfect participles
Perfect participles qualify or refer to their direct or indirect objects, to other participants in the event or to entities describing circumstances; even more often, they refer to actions or to states. They can also, like the imperfect participles, qualify nominals referring to subjects or themselves refer to subjects of actions. They appear to be always factive.

The perfect participle suffixes are -mlš, -dOk and -yOk; positive -dOk is used mainly in runiform and Manichaean sources while -yOk is never
used in those sources. Suffixes of these shapes appear also as finite verb forms, but the uses and meanings of the finite forms and of the perfect participles are different and not to be confused. -dOk does not in Old Turkic appear in finite use (as we shall show below) in its positive form but only as negative -madOk; this latter is the negative counterpart of both finite and infinite -mIš in earlier Old Turkic texts: -mAmlš comes up only in late Uygur. While finite -mIš (and with it finite -mAdOk) express evidentiality and mirativity, the perfect participles in -dOk / -mAdOk and -mIš (as well as the late -mAmlš) never have this content. Finite -yOk is vividly post-terminal, implying the speaker’s direct observation of an event (whereas the use of finite -mIš involves autopsy only if the speaker is using it as a mirative, then referring not to an event but to a state). The meaning of infinite -yOk does not seem to differ much from infinite -mIš, on the other hand, and that of infinite -mAyOk not much from infinite -madOk.

In the perfect domain, the earliest Old Turkic (including Orkhon Turkic, the Uygur kaganate inscriptions and most Manichaean texts) differs from the rest of the corpus: In the Orkhon inscriptions, -mIš (or -mis, as it is spelled there) mainly qualifies or refers to subjects, while -dOk appears in the inscriptions and in most Manichaean sources when the head refers to participators other than the subject (e.g. the direct or indirect object) or to circumstances (e.g. the time of the event). -mA-
dOk is well documented in all manner of Uygur texts as readily qualifying subjects as well as non-subjects; e.g. in arımadok tsey irinçülärin (TT IV B50) ‘my unpurified sins’ where the head is subject and täği unamadok avinçu ‘a pleasure woman not approved of by heaven’ from the IrqB or körmädök eșİmdaadök savlarig kördüm tep tedimiz (MaitH XX 14r5) ‘We said (about some) matters that we had seen (them although we) had neither seen (them) nor heard about (them)’, where the head is direct object.

In Orkhon Turkic, -dOk is spelled with t₁ or t₂ after stems ending in /l/ such as kazgan-, olan-, yazil-, yazım-, ber- but never after ones ending in other consonants or vowels; this apparently shows that /d/ was realised as a stop after the sonants. This distribution appears to have been retained in Manichaean texts, which write -tOk- with stems such as bol-, ängän-, ärsin-, kargan-, tägin-, ör-, ör-, ör-, kurtgar-, azgur-, kör- and turgur-. When a -dOk form is used not for qualifying a

---

483 T.Tekin 1997: 6 takes täği unamadok to be a sentence by itself, which he translates as ‘Heaven was apparently not pleased with it’. This is not acceptable because the ‘it’ which he introduces into his translation would have to refer forwards to avinçu, which zero anaphora do not do.
nominal but itself serves for reference and when it refers to an entity other than the subject, reference to this latter can appear in a possessive suffix added to it. This is by no means obligatory as it is in Turkish, however, and the -dOk form does appear without possessive suffix when the hearer or reader is expected to know the identity of the subject in some other way.

In section 4.622 we quote some examples of (positive) -dOk forms used as direct objects; most of them appear in Manichäan texts, but there is, e.g., an instance of är-dök+in ‘its being (acc.)’ in a rather late letter. This may not be an archaic trait in that case; rather, är-dök from är- ‘to be’ appears – as in Turkmen – to have developed a life of its own, independent of that of the suffix itself. If the literal source of ärdök tâg, corresponding to the common Buddhist term Skt. tathâta ‘thus-ness’, is ‘like what is’, this would mean that ärdök here refers to the subject of är-.

In a Buddhist text we have a headless -dOk form referring to the object of the subordinated verb and serving as subject of the whole sentence: ogri tep tedöktüöz någö ol (KP 59,5) ‘What is that which you have called a thief?’. A further such instance is quoted in section 4.621. In kältöküm bo tep ötünti ‘He said ‘These (the circumstances of) my coming’, on the other hand, the -dOk form, which serves as topic in a nominal sentence, appears to refer to circumstances (the same Buddhist text just quoted, KP 60). We also have -dOk forms in oblique cases: An inscriptional example (with 1st person possessive and the instrumental case) is biltökümün ödökümün bunça hiti̇ hitâdim (KÇ S 2) ‘I wrote all this text based on what I know and remember’. Æydökînçe kertü bo̩ur ârti ‘it used to come true according to what he said’ (M III nr.13 1 v3) and yarlı̇kadokumça ‘according to what I ordered’ (ms. U 311 b v4) are both from Manichäan sources. Then we have -dOk forms governed by postpositions and relational nouns: tutdokumuzda bâri ‘since we kept’ (Xw 148) is, again, Manichäan. Buru̇can Alp tarxan bâg elântök ârkœintök âgurînta (M 1 27, 10) ‘on the occasion of the coming to power of the lord B.A. tarxan’ could in principle be analysed in two ways: Either, as happens in many modern Turkic languages, the possessive suffix in âgur+în+s+ta refers to the subject of the adnominal participle, which does not itself inflect for subject but transfers that onto ûgur ‘occasion’, the head of the construction. Alternately (and I think correctly), ûg(u)rinta is taken to be part of the relational noun construction (see section 4.22); the -dOk forms themselves are then understood to refer to the action and not to the event’s circumstance.
In it ürdöki kuš üni ... äštilmäz ‘No barking of dogs and no sound of birds is heard ...’ (M III nr.32 r1) or bo kargantokin, alkantokin, känräsötkön vöntüsötkön bilmäz kiši iäk soguščä oyunčä sakunur ‘An ignorant person takes this cursing and quarreling of theirs to be just scolding and play’ (M I 9,16-18), the -dOk forms refer to the action; as the contexts show, the 3rd person singular possessive suffixes refer to plural subjects. The possessive suffix can also be wholly absent with -dOk forms used as perfect participles, if the context makes this reference superfluous, even if the verb is not impersonal; e.g. yarök kälp timärögig yaydok ücün (M III nr.1,IV v3) ‘because light came and dispersed darkness’: The -dOk form is often governed by ücün with the meaning ‘because’. In the -dOkn ücün phrase (discussed in section 4.635), intransitive verbs appear as freely as transitive ones. The locative of the -dOk form rather commonly serves as a common temporal converb (see section 4.633); it can also be governed by temporal postpositions such as bärü ‘since’ or kесrü and ken ‘after’. In Manichaean sources, the instrumental form (added to -dOk with possessive suffix) supplies ‘reasons’ for the main clause, e.g. azgurdokin ‘because he led (our senses) astray’ (Xw 19) or kop yerda ačig ümgäk körtökin ‘because they suffered bitter tortures everywhere’.

Tekin 1997 quotes instances of -dOk and -mAkdOk found in the runiform inscriptions and further deals with the etymology of this suffix and with its real or assumed finite uses.

-mIš forms are generally subject participles in Orkhon Turkic, whereas -dOk forms serve as perfect-domain non-subject participles of that dialect (as of Turkish). -mIš, which also serves the expression of indirective status (section 3.27), is often spelled with s² (not š or s¹) in Orkhon Turkic: More in some texts than in others; the BQ inscription often changes -mIs forms of its source, the KT inscription, to -mIš without changing much else in the passages, and inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire write -mIš even more often. These fluctuations do not specifically concern this particular suffix but are related to the spelling and pronunciation of Orkhon Turkic /š/ in general; nevertheless, one gets the impression that /š/ surfaces as s a bit more often in this suffix than elsewhere.

In Uygur as distinct from Orkhon Turkic, -mIš forms refer to non-subjects more often than to subjects. Examples for adnominal

---

484 Yenisey inscriptions have both š¹ and š², but Orkhon Turkic uses the character serving as š² in the Yenisey inscriptions both in front and back contexts.
inscriptional -miš participles are *elsiramiš kagansıramiš bodun* (KT E13) ‘the people who lost state and ruler’ and *igidmiš kagan* (BQ N6) ‘the ruler who has nourished (you)’. In *anta kalmiş* ‘those among them who stayed there’ (KT S9; similar expression in Tuñ 4) the verb form itself refers to the subject. *tägmiš in türk bodun k[i]lïnga[li], türk kagan olorgalı Şantung bolijka taloy ögüzki tägmiš yok ärmiş* (Tuñ 18; there is a similar passage in Tuñ 47) can be understood in participial use, giving the meaning ‘Since the Türk people came into existence and since a Türk ruler gained power there it is said that nobody had reached the town(s) of Shantung or the sea’. Another possibility (cf. T.Tekin 1968: 179) is that it is to be understood as action noun: ‘... it is said that it (i.e. the Türk people; or ‘he’, i.e. the Türk kagan) had never reached ...’. The latter possibility is supported by the same construction appearing in Fedakår 239: *ol üdün uluş üzü burxan tişi [en]miş* yok ärti; bolar yahoklar tümän türlig ömgäk ömgäni ... ‘At that time the buddha Tisya had not yet descended upon the people; these persons were suffering a myriad sorts of suffering and ...’. There is one clear Orkhon Türkic example for -miš in non-subject use: *kağımız üçimiz kazganniš bodun* (KT E26; BQ E22). Tekin takes this passage to signify “the people who were conquered by our father and uncle”; however, the Türk people, who are here being referred to, were hardly conquered by Kööl Tegin’s father and uncle but rather were conquerors together with them. It might just be possible, therefore, that the -miš forms here also qualify their subject, the nominatives *kağımız üçimiz* standing for comitative content. Had it not been for this example, the Orkhon Türkic use of the -miš participle would have been identical to the Ottoman and Turkish one, whereas the Uygur use of -miš reminds one of the use of -gAn in many Non-Oguz languages. The inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire keep the use of -miš forms within the sphere of subject participles. We have, first, the proper name *Ozmüş* (‘one who has prevailed’) *Tegin* in ŠU N9 and Taryat E6 and 9 and the regal name *Türridä Bolmiş* (‘born in heaven’) *El Emiş* (‘who has organised the people’) *Billgä (or Uygur) kagan* in ŠU N1, Taryat S6 and W1 and 6 and Tes 12. *anta kalmiş bodun* (ŠU N3) reminds one of *anta kalmişi* quoted above from the Orkhon inscriptions and appears to signify ‘that part of the nation which remained there’.

485 See section 3.211 for the *-strA-* formation.
486 The string MIŞ appears at the beginning of a line and the end of the previous one is torn away with about three letters missing; the editor’s t(a)yš ìnmiş makes no sense. Tisya, the name of a previous Buddha, has already appeared several times in Uygur texts as *tişi*. 
In Classical Uygur, \(-d\text{Ok}\) is not used as positive non-subject perfect participle; the whole perfect domain is covered by \(-m\text{Iš}\), \(-m\text{Iš}\) and \(-d\text{Ok}\) enter into complementary distribution in that \(-m\text{Adok}\) serves as negative counterpart of \(-m\text{Iš}\); \(-m\text{AmIš}\) appears rarely, and only in very late Uygur sources. This is the situation e.g. in the voluminous Suv, where there are 11 \(-d\text{Ok}\) forms all referring to the action and not to any participator,\(^{487}\) 26 instances of \(-m\text{AdOk}\) but, on the other hand, only 3 instances of \(-m\text{AmIš}\) (all three in 57,13-15, where they are contrasted with \(-m\text{Iš}\) forms of the same verbs). Cf. käl\text{madōk} üdtä tugar tugmaksizän ‘He will in the future (käl-mä-dök üd) be born without birth’ (BT I D161); kut bulmadok toyiñlar (Maitr XXIV Endbl 13) ‘monks who have not attained salvation’.

\(-m\text{Iš}\) forms not representing their subject often have possessive suffixes referring to the subject, as zaxariya dendarniñ ölüm täginmişi (U I 9,9) ‘how the priest Zakharias met his death’; kälmişiñizâ (HTs VII 2046) ‘when we came’ (literally ‘at our completed coming’), kämişiñizîñzâ (HTs VII 2147) ‘because you have thrown it away’. They do not, however, always get the genitive of personal pronouns: anîn män anta a\text{"}ïš ïm kärgäk ‘therefore I should get born there’. In section 3.24 we mentioned an emphatic construction of the shape \(-m\text{Iš}+\text{Im bar}\) which clearly involves \(-m\text{Iš}\) forms used as action nouns.

Reference to subjects of such action nouns by possessive suffixes referring to the subject, as zaxariya dendarniñ ölüm täginmişi (U I 9,9) ‘how the priest Zakharias met his death’; kälmişiñizâ (HTs VII 2046) ‘when we came’ (literally ‘at our completed coming’), kämişiñizîñzâ (HTs VII 2147) ‘because you have thrown it away’. They do not, however, always get the genitive of personal pronouns: anîn män anta a\text{"}ïš ïm kärgäk ‘therefore I should get born there’. In section 3.24 we mentioned an emphatic construction of the shape \(-m\text{Iš}+\text{Im bar}\) which clearly involves \(-m\text{Iš}\) forms used as action nouns.

Reference to subjects of such action nouns by possessive suffixes is not obligatory; thus in bo ülişiñ Samtso a çarî ... çoomanka barmişiñ başlanur, ... ät'öz kodmiší üzü üzülür ‘this section starts with Xuanzang having gone ... to Ç. and ends with his death’, where the \(-m\text{Iš}\) forms refer to the action. The introduction to another HTs section (HTs VII 9) has the same form. bo nom bitiñişi buynan üdür kiлин ‘this meritorious deed consisting of having had the sűra written down’ shows an adnominal action noun in \(-m\text{Iš}\). In tegin alknini taplañan, tük taloy öğüzän kirmişig tapłąñ (KP 15,3) ‘The prince didn’t like any (of the other ideas presented to him), he only liked going out\(^{488}\) to the sea’, the verb is not impersonal either, though the subject of the \(-m\text{Iš}\) form is again not expressed: The reader understands it to be the same as the subject of the main verb. In the sentence ol bermiş buşiña kilmış üdürü

\(^{487}\) Another four instances of \(-d\text{Ok}\) which appear in the colophons or in the Buyan Ävirmäk section which is a later addition represent the finite \(-dI\) past in the 1st pers. pl., and show that these sections belong to Middle Turkic. The Buyan Ävirmäk has been excluded from the material serving as base for this grammar.

\(^{488}\) kir- for this meaning is a calque on a Chinese expression, as shown by Hamilton in his note.
Because of those alms which (I) gave and the good deeds which (I) performed I found the bright [heavens] as retribution’, reference to the subject is inherited from the main verb. In the following example (from Suv 5.8) the perfect participle used as action noun is also adnominal but it has a subject, referred to by a possessive suffix on the head: korkmaylar, m(ā)n amā sızlärkā tirilmiš tiltağının sözläyin ‘Don’t be afraid, let me now tell you all why I got resurrected’. ögmüş yını sâvinmâdının, ārmiş yını yerinmâdin ikiğükâ barça bir tâg âdâulîg bolurlar burxanlar (U III 73,21), finally, signifies ‘without being glad when somebody praises them nor sorry when somebody criticizes them they, the Buddhhas, have an equally positive attitude towards both’. F.W.K. Müller’s translation as “Weder über das Lob freuen sie sich, noch vom Tadel fühlen sie sich betroffen” is acceptable because the context lets the reader understand Lob and Tadel as action nouns and complete the subject of ög- and yer- as ‘somebody’. It is misleading, however, when Gabain 1974: 73 defines -miš, -miš as “zeitlich indifferentes Verbalnomen, aktiven oder passiven Charakters” only because -miš clauses can qualify both subject and object heads, and wrong when she renders ögmüş as ‘Lob’ in §122 in the same way as she renders yınmür as ‘Regen’ in §123 and tügün as ‘Knoten’ in §124, as if it were a derived lexeme.

-miş forms are also used as attributive and predicative participles, as the two instances in the following sentence: in ol yakâ yetak yâzîr âytâq alkatmiš yer ... bešt boltüün boltmiš ol (BT V 188-191) ‘That bright and shining praised land with diamond appearance is divided into five parts’. Note that yer is the object of bolt- but the subject of reversive alkat- ‘get (oneself) praised’. A number of -miš forms from causative -(X)t- stems (in later sources replaced by -(tXl)- stems) are lexicalised: No bases are attested for alkatmiš, amratmiš, bayutmiš, bulgatmiš, eritmiš, kargatmiš and so forth. olar bo darnı sözlämišig umagaylar âmgätgäli (DhâSû 12) ‘They will be unable to torment somebody who has recited this dhâranî’. In two attributive examples quoted in the previous paragraph from M III nr.13 the -miš forms qualify their objects. Predicative participial (and perfect) -miš presumably has to be followed by copular ârür or ol, as it would otherwise be confused with evidential -miš, which is always predicative; the former is dealt with in section 3.26, the latter in section 3.27.

The -yOk form was in use only in Uygur; its suffix is attested with a rounded low vowel in Brâhmî script, in TT VIII H5 (ünmüyökökî) and
L.18 and 21-22 (both tükmäyök).\(^{489}\) It has a finite use as vivid past, a past with relevance for the speaker’s present, as discussed in section 3.26. In infinite use, however, it merely expresses post-terminal content, mirroring the split found in the use of -mIš between finite and infinite use; e.g. bulganyok köğül tïnlïglar ‘creatures with confused hearts’ (Pothi 227-8); tükäl yazoklug, sïnyok čaxšaputlug dentar ‘an utterly sinful priest who had broken the precepts’ (fr. TI D 200 in the n. to TT V A 23); ädgü tetyök nom ‘the teaching considered to be good’ (Pothi 108). Negated e.g. övkä köğül örtmäyök tïnlïg ‘a creature which never let itself get into an angry frame of mind’ (U III 42,12). In all the instances quoted hitherto, the head was the subject of the -yÖk form. Negated and qualifying the verb’s object, as the negative counterpart of -mIš, as it were, we have, e.g.: kilmayok ayig kilïnäyök tïnlïglar ‘creatures with confused hearts’ (Pothi 108). Negated e.g. övkä köğül örtmäyök tïnlïg ‘a creature which

---

\(^{489}\) The low vowel is not certain: All the Bëhmi examples we have use the suffix after ḫul, and this may have been a lowering factor. The suffix is in use in South Siberian Turkic, mostly in the shape -čuk, and was borrowed into Kamas, a Samoyed language spoken in South Siberia, as -yuk.

\(^{490}\) Concerning this last instance one might consider the possibility that it is a coyst’s misreading of sïn-ток; cf. also the passage discussed in OTWF footn. 271.
curse him incessantly’. The preceding sentence quotes people’s judgments about this person.

3.284. Projection participles

The participles with the suffixes -sXk (used in the runiform sources and in the Manichæan Uygur X*ästvānift), -gU and -gUlXk (used in all other sources) are here called ‘projection participles’ because they are used for presenting projections of expectations, evaluations and intentions.

The shape of the -sXk suffix needs some clarification. That it has fourfold harmony in the runiform inscriptions follows from the fact that kün tugsuk ‘east’ is spelt with "q in runiform script (Qara Balgasun B7) whereas batsık ‘west’ is spelt with runiform ‘q in KT S2 = BQ N2 and as b’t’s/lk in Qara Balgasun B9. Other forms with rounded-vowel bases are to(s)suk in KT S8 and BQ N6, olorsukum in Tuñ 12 and 22, ölsüküän and tutsukum in KT S10 and BQ N8, tugsuk in KT E4 and 8 and S2, BQ E5 and 8 and Ongin 2. In none of these is the vowel of the suffix written out explicitly. On the other hand, the suffix is spelled with s’ in the Tuñ 22 and Ongin 2 examples, although their bases are olor- and tug- respectively, as is the suffix of udîsïk in Tuñ 12 and 22. Since s’ often appears beside /i/ as well as beside front vowels, the idea that the suffix was -slk in the Orkhon texts (as proposed by T.Tekin) cannot be wholly ruled out. Rounding is in this suffix actually documented first in the Qara Balgasun inscription from the late Uygur steppe empire (quoted above), but implicit vowels must nevertheless be expected to be either /A/ or /X/: -sXk therefore remains the form we take the suffix to have had. The k ~ g variation is found also within the Xw, whose ms. in Manichæan script uses quite distinct characters for the two phonemes. Referring to the lines of that ms. we find ançola-sïk (222 and 248), olor-suk (246 and 273) on the one hand, alkan-sïg (210), kigür-süg (229), sözlämä-sig (295) and iš lämä-sig (297) on the other. The likely explanation for this variation is that the form was no longer alive in the language of the person copying it from a source in Uygur writing and that he therefore did not know how it was pronounced; this is, after all, the only extant Uygur text with this form.491

491 Otherwise the ms. confuses velars only very rarely (once GSWG for ägsük, which appears correctly elsewhere in the text, and twice SGYZ for sâkiz). The sentence esïg kiäüg bersägim (b’r’s’g’m) bar ärms was read in Ongin 10 in Clauson’s 1957 reedition, and there translated as ‘I had a wish to give my services’. Tekin 1968 proposed reading ber-sig-im, assigning the form to the suffix discussed here. He is right in stating that -sA-(X)g, which Clauson was presumably thinking of, is
In one Orkhon Turkic passage repeated in different texts a -sXk form appears to be used several times in finite use for expressing predictions, with reference to the subject in a possessive suffix appended to the form itself; see section 3.26 for that.

Infinite -sXk either refers to the action or to non-subjects, or qualifies non-subject heads. Examples for the first are tüün ülsüküm kälmädi, kämtüz olorsukum kälmädi ‘I did not feel like sleeping at night nor like resting at daytime’ (Tuñ 12), yaqilip őlsüküyün ... bunta urtum ‘I set down here (how) you will needs err and die’ (KT S10), ançolastik k(ą)rgäk ãrti ‘it was necessary to give presents’ (Xw 176-177) or wusantti olorsuk törö ‘the rule of sitting in fasting’ (Xw 175). el tutsuk yer ‘the place to rule the realm (from)’ (KT S4) or sözlämäsig ... söz ‘words which one should not utter’ (Xw 198) are examples for forms of this formation qualifying non-agent participants. The only -sXk forms in use in other Manichæan texts are the petrified kün tugsuk ‘east’ (e.g. in M III 9,1) and kün batisik ‘west’ e.g. in M III 9,3); these two terms appear also in a runiform inscription and were known to Kâşgarî as well.

In non-inscriptional Old Turkic (except the Xw), the non-factive task of -sXk is filled by forms in -gU or -gU+lXk. There is a single, abstract -gU form already in the KT and BQ inscriptions (E23 and E19 respectively): kürägü åæ9çIèé#èçÛêìëí#î›íç åïÛêñð›íò#ó íôõô
æ î›èöø÷è
î ‘Because of your obstinacy / unruliness you introduced evil into the...
realm of your emperor’. As bases of -gU, derivates such as őlürügü ‘killer’ or kolgügü ‘beggar’, -gU forms did not have perfective meaning either. -gUILxk, another composite suffix based on -gU, is necessitative; +ILxk appears to have been added to -gU to make this meaning explicit. -gU is negated with -mA- (as is -gU/ILxk); e.g. in uzatmagu (BT V 908), kilmagu kilinč ‘a act not to be carried out’ or túnlă kilintúz sakînmagü sakinüp ... (l.13 in ms. Wilkens 421) ‘by night and by day thinking things which are not to be thought’. This is a clear indicator of its belonging to inflection and not word formation. The fact that some -gU forms got lexicalised is no counter-argument, as lexicalisation took place with inflected forms as well. Nor is the fact that -gU+sXz is also attested a counter-argument: Similar to it we have the equally nominally negated -gU/ILxk+sXz (OTWF section 3.312) and -mA+sXz (OTWF section 3.328) beside the verbally negated -mA-gU/ILxk and -mA-mAk (a rather late and rare form). The difference between the two ways of negation is clearest with -mAk, in that -mAksXz is a full-fledged nominal whereas -mA/mAk stays an infinitive.

The ‘projection’ quality of -gU will be clear from the meaning of, e.g., adin bergüm yok üçün (Sa2,2 in SammlUigKontr 2) as ‘because I have nothing else to give’. In the following Uygur instances the form with -gU refers to a necessity or an intention: sözläšgü ärsär ünüp kägil (UigBrief D) ‘If you have anything to discuss, come on here’. In tünliğläřig kütgarguda ‘when one intends to save living creatures’, the whole -gU expression has been put into the locative, the -gU form again referring to a projected action; the use of -gU+sA is discussed in section 4.633. In the following two sentences the form is the object of a verb of saying and a verb of sensing; alkiš bašik sözläšgü, ... amv(a)rd(i)şn kilip yığıngug ayu y(a)r̄ıkadiñiz olarka (Pothi 226-7) ‘Thou hast commanded them to say blessings and hymns, ... to concentrate one’s mind and meditate’; maytri bodisavtnï ... burxan kutin bulgusin ... ukar mu siz? ‘Can you ... grasp that bodhisattva Maitreya is to ... attain Buddhahdom?’. In the last-mentioned instance the subject of the -gU form was in the genitive, but a construction of the shape -gU+sI yok has the subject in

kör-, which editors before Tekin had thought of, much less accords with the context even when taken with the meaning ‘to obey’. I take kürägü to have been lexicalised; the context does not permit projectional -gU here.

493 A few examples for this suffix sequence are quoted in OTWF 138; cf. also bo ... sâvgüsüz taplaguşuz yarsînîç düöz (Suv 613,2) ‘this ... disgusting body not to be loved or desired’.

494 -gUsXz is not the negative counterpart of -gU/ILxk, as stated in Gabain 1974 § 141.
the nominative: *ig toga ketgüsi yok* (U II 45,4) ‘It is not expected that the illnesses will disappear’; *măniş kŏngülüm yürükım [...] sintată öği ketip bargısı yok* (TT X 466) ‘It is [quite] unlikely that my heart should abandon you’. *sığgusı yok ārdi* ‘it could not be expected to fit in’ shows the same analytical construction with abstract *-gU* transposed into the past.

Like the ones with *-sXk*, *-gU* forms can also refer to or qualify non-subject participants: In *bergü bulmatin* (KP 10,4) ‘not finding anything to give’, e.g., the form refers to the direct object; this is also the task of the form *sakinmagu* ‘things not to be thought’ quoted above, and of the form *kilmagu kilinë* ‘a deed not to be done’. In *ayancaq kŏngülın yüksûqi ayагlıq atlıq kajım mani burxan* (Pothi 2) ‘my respected and famous father, the prophet Mani, whom one should worship with a reverent mind’ it qualifies the indirect object, in *engî üdi yagumîş* ‘the time when he is expected to descend is said to be nearing’, the time adjunct. *äv in olorgu äv* (HTs III 739) ‘a house to live in’ is the place of the activity referred to in the verb. In TT VA 88-98 we have three instances of *-gU* used adnominally to qualify entities which serve as instruments to the action and a fourth one referring to the action itself: *alğaşturgu sakînê* (TT VA 88) ‘meditation for weakening (the demons)’, *alğaşturgu biliglär* (TT VA 92) ‘notions for weakening’, *ulug alğaşturgu tamga* (TT VA 94) ‘the great weakening seal’ and *ulug alğaşturgu iš* (TT VA 97) ‘the business of the great weakening’. *ornangu* (TT I 114, M I 27,32) and *kongu* (M I 27,35) ‘dwelling-place’ are local. A number of examples qualify *yol* ‘way’, clearly used as instrument in the contexts quoted; among them we have *ozgu kutrułąg yol yiňak* (Pothi 63) ‘the way and direction to salvation’, *t(â)grî yerînî bargu ... yol* (Pothi 72) ‘the way by which to go to the land of gods’ and *boşungu yol ağıntu şatu bilmâşok üçün* (M III nr.1 IV v14-15) ‘because he knew no way to freedom and no ladder for rising’. In the following three instances the *-gU* form qualifies the means to an end or the material, i.e. an instrument: *tûkädi n(i)goşklarînî suyîn yazokîn ökîngû xwastwan(i)vt* (Xw 221, ms. B) ‘The Xw., with which the auditors are to repent their sins, has ended’; *kalî uz kîşî uzlangu üd bûlmasur ...* (M I 17,) ‘when, e.g., a craftsman does not find the material to carry out his craft (with) ...’; *alğaşturgu sakînê* ‘meditation by which to weaken (bad influences)’.

* -gU forms can also be used predicatively, as in *bo yerîntêñö yer suvdakî tûnilçlar birök burxan körkin kûrîn kurtulgu ârsär ...* (U II 17,26) ‘If, now. (any) creatures in this world are to be saved by seeing the figure of Buddha, ...’; this is followed by *pr(a)tikabut körkin*
kurtuluğu tınlığı arsär (U II 17.28) ‘If they are creatures to be saved through the appearance of a pratyeka-buddha,...’, where the -gU form is attributive. Similarly sinxadivipka bargu arsär suv yolın barmak kärgük siz (HTsPar 108r19 quoted in the note to HTsBriefe 1870) ‘If (you) are to go to Ceylon you have to go by sea’. The construction of these two sentences, where the subjects are referred to by nominals in the nominative case, should be compared to sözläşgü arsär discussed above, with the possessive suffix referring to the subject. There, the -gU form was taken to refer to the content of a future discussion; it could also refer to the projected event.

-gU also appears within the construction in -gU ol referred to in section 5.2, which expresses obligation or advice. The analytical form -gUçA arsär is discussed among the conditional constructions in section 4.64. någü ... bulgüća bolsa (Ad3,16 in SammlUigKontr 2) is ‘whatever one can find of ...’.

-gU tāg signifies ‘suitable for the activity denoted by the verb’: tariğ tariğu tāg ădği är karabaş (ZiemeSklav III 14) ‘a male slave good for working in the field’, tapingu tāg kīz karabaş (ZiemeSklav III 16) ‘a female slave suitable for service’, kilmagu tāg nā någü işi (U III 54,13) ‘some unsuitable piece of behaviour’. Korkgu tāg yalinlar (MaitH XX 1r18) are ‘frightful flames’; the meaning of korkgu tāg (attested also e.g. in TT X 362 and DKPAMPb 81) should be similar to korkmeğ (formation discussed in OTWF section 3.311). -gU tāg is also put to predicative use: oglanlarımın bulmatın ülvirgü tāg bolur mân (BT XIII 2,48) ‘Not finding my children (i.e. if I didn’t find them) I would be as if in a rave’. Alimcilarım ma tâlim bolup turgu tāg bolmayın kaçıp yaşıp ... (Mi19,4 in SammlUigKontr 2) signifies ‘my creditors also having become numerous (the situation) was not suitable for staying around and I fled and hid and ...’. From this comes Rabgüzîl’s use of the phrase -gU tāg turur in the meaning ‘to intend / to be ready to carry out the main action’ (documented in Schinkewitsch 1926: 100). The meaning ‘suitable for doing’ appears to have moved towards ‘in order to do’ in the example yetip ikilayı yangınca yetgü tāg kâlir oglanî (BT XIII 2,44) ‘Till (I) get (there) and come back again (someone) could come and might lead the children off’. The accusative object oglanî is here governed by yet-, showing that yetgü tāg functions as a verb phrase

495 Gabain reads krgâksiz and translates this as ‘braucht man nicht’. In view of the fact that Ceylon is an island, I have here followed Anderson 2002 § 1.1.3 in taking siz not to be the privative suffix but the 2nd person plural pronoun, on assumption that the Chinese text is compatible with this. There is no need to take -gU är- to be an auxiliary construction, as Anderson did in the lecture referred to.
although it is also a postpositional phrase. This construction developed further in Middle Turkic; Brockelmann 1954: 247-8 gives numerous examples from the QB and a great variety of Middle Turkic sources.\footnote{The sequence subsequently fused to give -\textit{gUdäg}; Brockelmann 1954: 248 quotes Nav'\' as defining it as a special form for expressing conjectures. -\textit{gAdAg} lives on in 'Tuvan or in Khakas, expressing the same content of ‘it seems, it looks as if’.} Cf. also the sequence -\textit{gU tāg ārmāz} expressing impossibility, dealt with in section 3.253.

The sequence -\textit{gUlXk tāg} is attested e.g. in M III nr.7 II v1, in \textit{elīgkā yaraguluk tāg yontug arīīrēcā ‘as one cleans a horse which would be suitable for a king’; there are other examples in M III nr.5 r4. See section 4.636 (on final clauses) for the use of the analytical forms -\textit{gU ārmāz} and -\textit{gU+kA}.

In -\textit{gUlXk} e.g. in \textit{nomumīn išidgūlūk küsūš} (MaitH XV 2v1) ‘the wish to hear my teaching’, it seems as if the suffix +\textit{IXk} has kept its meaning, as the wish is directed, towards future hearing activity. \textit{kudīkī bolguluk savlar} (BT II 232) are ‘matters to be disparaged’, \textit{sözlägūlūk savlar} (BT II 257) ‘things one is to say’. Manichaean texts also have such forms e.g. 4 times in TT II.2 41-44. -\textit{gUlXk} forms can be used predicatively, e.g. nācā tāŋlīg kafīn kūčīłg yavlak yāk īčkåk bolsalvar, bodisatv ugušlīg elig bāngnīn āŋ mēntīn ātōştīntāki bir āvin ātūsīŋgī ymā ada tūda tāgūrgāli ugułok ārmāzlār (U IV A 260) ‘However numerous, powerful and evil \textit{pretas} and \textit{bhūtas} there might be, they would not be able to do any harm even to a single hair on the body of the king of \textit{bodhisattva} lineage’. Now consider the sentence \textit{kūsūš ūm ol ātun ārguluk / tōlp yertinčēg yaretāčika} (Suv 372,12)\footnote{This is a verse passage, whence the unusual word order. Cf. the sentence quoted at the end of section 4.8.} ‘It is my wish to pray to him who brightens up the whole world’. The -\textit{gUlXk} form has here become the predicate of a nominal sentence and refers to activities the speaker considers to be desirable, in accordance with the function of this fused suffix. In the following example, the -\textit{gUlXk} forms, with possessive suffixes referring to the object of their verbs, themselves refer to the action (\textit{bil- uk-}) which is expected to be carried out: \textit{keŋ yōrūŋ kīltīlār, bilgūlūkīn ukgulukūn īrnattu tūktītīp ...} (HTs VIII 72) ‘They set forth a detailed commentary. Having finished to determine how they (i.e. the teachings) were to be understood, …’. The same can be said of the following example, which even has a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person possessive suffix: \textit{udumbar čāčāk tāg alp tuʃgulukunuʃ ūzā tāŋlančēg ārūr sīz} (Suv 654,5)
‘You are marvellous by being as difficult to come by as the udumbara flower’.

Section 3.312 in OTWF deals with the composite suffix -gUlXksXz, the formation there being called ‘the negative modal oblique’. Its content should not be confused with that of -mAgUlXk (attested e.g. in HtSPar 14 r22 and Suv 6711,17): When used predicatively, the latter expresses the speakerwriter’s attitude with respect to the non-desirability of a proposition, while -gUlXksXz qualifies nominals as related to such an attitude on the part of the speaker.

Orkhon Turkic and Uygur -gUlXk can form small clauses with ‘difficult’ or ‘easy’ as predicate: yuyka kalïnr bolsar topolguluk alp ârïnï (Tuñ 13) ‘If thin gets thick it is hard to pierce, they say’; in a rather similar phrase, bo inmelun šastr ârïnlï târïnlï alp tüpkärgulülïk ârïnr (HTs VIII 152) ‘As for this Ying ming lun šâstra, it is exceedingly profound and hard to fathom’. učuz bulguluk in ol barča učuz bulguluk ol ‘All that is easy to find’ (DKPAMPb 358) is constructed in the same way as alp tüpkärgulülïk of the previous example. In tünlïglïrïng ùtläyï ùrglãyïn alp ñutgululuk učün ‘because it is difficult to save living beings through advice and admonishment’ (DKPAMPb 115) we find a similar small clause – again with alp as predicate – governed by the causal postposition or conjunction.

The projection participles never qualify or refer to subjects, which the imperfect participles generally, the perfect participles sometimes do. The label of ‘projection’ attached to the forms of this section is to be understood as an either epistemological or volitional orientation towards possible future events. kïn tugsuk and kïn batsïk are the directions in which one expects the sun to rise or to set with no volition attached; maytri bodisavtnï ... burxan kutïn bulgustï, similarly, refers to something expected to happen in the future. el tutsuk yer on the other hand, is the place which the speaker considers to be best suited for the activity of ruling; olorgu âv a house to live in, one suitable for living. sözlïmüsïg ... söz are words one should not utter, kîlmaq kîlïnç something one should not do. bergï is something to give, intended for giving. tünlïglïrïng ñutgargu refers to the project of saving creatures, something one plans to do.

3.285. The prospective
The imminent future form in -gAllr is difficult to classify among the parts of speech: It is never found as an attribute, nor ever as the head of a nominal phrase and thus is never, in fact, a participle in any narrow sense. It is either used predicatively with pronominal subject (like
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Turkish -Iyor) or governed by postpositions or by ärkän ‘while’ (which otherwise governs locatives, yok ‘non-existence’ and the aorist). The uses of finite -gAlIr (attested in that function also in DLT and QB) are discussed in section 3.26. Its most common non-finite use is to be governed by ičün, e.g. in koluñalarıñ äädäddürgälir bädütgälir ičün (BT III 77) ‘in order to let their shoots materialize and grow’ or män ol ... köni kertü savığ közügälir ičün (U III 68,31) ‘so that I might document that true statement’. A few sentences before the last expression (U III 68,22) the same speaker says ağizimın ümmiš köni kertü savığ közügälir barayın with the same verb, signifying ‘Let me go to document the true statement which I uttered’; this highlights the similarity between the suffixes -gAlI and -gAlIr (which perhaps comes from -gAlI ärür).

Note that -gU and -gUlX also appear in final clauses, -gAlI being the supine suffix and the forms in -gU and -gUlXx necessitative participles. In the example častanı eligig ... sigirgälir osoglug kılınp (U I 41) ‘they behaved as if they were about to swallow’, another example of -gAlIr ärün is quoted in section 4.633.

3.286. Converbs
Converbs are verb forms used adverbially or, especially in the case of -(X)p and -(X)pAn, used within a sequel of clauses forming a sentence, linked so that their content comes to be understood as coordinative. There are two types of exceptions in which we find converbs in adnominal use: One is the construction with vowel verb found in tik-ä kulgak-ìn ‘with cocked ears’, discussed below in this section, where the whole phrase is adverbial. The other is the use of är-ip linking two attributive satellites to each other when the first is more complex than the second; see the end of section 4.122 for that.

Converbs’ subjects are often identical to that of the verb to which they are subordinated; when do they have their own subject it appears in the nominative. A third possibility, when no subject is stated, is that the clause’s content is meant to hold for any appropriate entity as subject; a fourth that the subject should be supplied by the addressee or reader from out of the context. Thus, when, at the beginning of a letter but after the address, we find the sentence adrlgalı yirilgali ärü ärü [für] keç boltı (HTs VII 2064) we know that we have to translate ‘Bye
and bye\textsuperscript{498} it has become a long time since (you and me) were separated and torn apart' although the con
verbs in -\textit{gAll} are not accompanied by any explicit reference to a subject.
From the morphological point of view we can classify converb suffixes into ones that are opaque and such that show, in various
degrees of transparency, that they come from some other form. Some
elements bringing verb stems into adverbal function are in fact not mere
morphological forms but whole phrases, in which nominal verb forms
are governed by a postposition. We shall here list all converbs and
discuss their morphological aspect; we start from opaque converb
suffixes, adding their various evident or putative derivates, then
mention converbial derivates from verbal nominals. The functions and
syntactic uses to which all these are put are dealt with in section 4.63
(‘Clauses as adjuncts’). Adjunct clauses can, in Old Turkic, also be
formed without resorting to simple or complex converbs, by using
conjunctions; such structures are not mentioned in the present section.
The conditional suffix dealt with in section 3.287 is actually also a
converb suffix at least in the runiform inscriptions: We have already, in
connection with -(X)p, granted that converb clauses can be highly
independent syntactically; the -\textit{sAr} form is a converb in that it has
neither verbal nor nominal inflection and is used adverbally. It does,
however, become increasingly linked to the category of subject person
already at a very early stage and moves towards finite status in the
course of the development of Old Turkic.

The most common converb suffix appears to be -(X)p\textsuperscript{499} It is further
discussed in 4.631, the section on the use of contextual converbs.
Clearly related to it morphologically is the suffix -(X)pAn, also
discussed in that section. -(X)pAn is used in runiform inscriptions (e.g.
\textit{el ırgımin anta ırgipän etitdim} ‘I set up the national throne there and
had (the place) arranged’ in \textit{ȘU}), rather commonly in the runiform ms.
IrqB and in Manichaean texts (e.g. \textit{äzü]g savıña arılpän} ‘cheated by her
false words’ in BT V 277, \textit{ay tāqri ırıdsınta enipän}, 1.9 of the hymn

\textsuperscript{498} \textit{ār-ū}, the vowel converb of the copula, is only attested in lexicalised \textit{ārū ărū}
‘gradually etc.’.
\textsuperscript{499} Johanson 1988: 136 quotes several unacceptable ‘etymologies’ for this suffix, says
‘we shall refrain from adding new proposals here’ and then does add a new proposal in
the long footnote immediately attached to this sentence. Johanson’s proposal is
unacceptable as well, as it is based on an intermediate form ‘-\textit{yUb}’ (to be derived from a
Mongolian converb suffix ending in \textit{U}); such a form is not and cannot have been
attested, as there is no trace of a ‘buffer \textit{y}’ in Old Turkic, nor indeed anywhere outside
Oguz.
edited in *UAJb* 16:221-2, ‘coming down from the palace of the Moon God’). *kara xanka barïpan, yalavač barïpan kälmädiñiz bâgim-â* in the epitaph E30 tells of a South-Siberian nobleman who went as a messenger to the Qarakhanid ruler and did not return. There are also a number of examples in the DLT in verse. This not very common form and the even rarer -(X)pAnXn (early Uygur, Manichaean and Buddhist) are discussed in Johanson 1988, who quotes a number of examples. Among the etymologies quoted or suggested there for -(X)pAn, the only possible one seems to be the segmentation *-bA+n*, i.e. that it should be formed with the instrumental suffix +(X)n as in -mAtI+n discussed below. Another possibility is that -(X)pAn comes from -(X)pAnXn by haplology; that (attested e.g. in *ukupanîn* in Mait 23r12, *körüpanîn* in MaitH Y 194) would come from -(X)p anîn, i.e. from the instrumental form of ol used in the meaning ‘thereby’ beginning the superordinate clause, secondarily adapting to synharmonism as the two fused: Johanson stresses the instrumental meaning of these two forms as against the other Old Turkic converbs including -(X)p, and in UW 142 we find a number of examples for the ‘superfluous’ use of anîn after subordinate clauses. IrqB 35 can be read as *kugu kuş kanatîña urupanîn kalîyu barïpan ögiñâ kañîña tägürmiš* or *kugu kuş kanatîña urup anîn kalîyu barïpan ögiñâ kañîña tägürmiš* and in both cases signify ‘The swan put him on his wings and so rose in the air and brought him to his parents’. Johanson 1988: 146 quotes three DLT cases of anîn written separately after -(X)p forms; these passages, which he interprets as instances of wrong spelling, in fact agree with the use of anîn in Uygur and go a long way towards explaining -(X)pAnXn. The problem with the Johanson hypothesis is that -(X)pAn by no means always has instrumental meaning; in Xw 134, a rather early text, its use is temporal or conditional: *ögrâ nâ bar (ärmîš in a ms.) tepân bîltîmîz* clearly means, in its context, ‘We know what there was (or ‘what there is said to have been’) before that’ or perhaps, more literally, ‘If one said ‘What was there (or ‘What is there supposed to have been’) before , we know (the answer)’.500

A construction of the form nâ + -(X)p convert + Ok appears to have exclusively temporal meaning; see section 4.633.

In BT XIII 1.96 we find the verse *yagîz ye[r] tâginêñ sâriñ sîz* in quite fragmentary context, translated as ‘über die ganze braune Erde seid ihr

---

500 The te- form corresponds to Turkic *dive* or *dese*. The three subsequent sentences have the same structure though they contain different interrogative clauses.
ausgedehnt’. \footnote{Better perhaps ‘You have been showing endurance like the brown earth’. The beginning of the following verse is lost, but in none of the more than 100 interpretable lines of the poem is there any instance of a word divided between the lines. \textit{sârip sîz} as imperative makes no sense either, especially since another sentence in the context also shows the polite plural address to a bodhisattva.}

This should be an instance of a verb phrase of the shape -(X)p with pronoun, which is put to finite use in some modern Turkic languages and in Middle Turkic (cf. Brockelmann 1954: 313 §g); I have not come across any other such instance in any variety of Old Turkic, including Qarakhanid (though -(X)p ël-, discussed in section 3.251, appears not to be all too rare).

Another contextual converb suffix is that of the vowel converb, most of whose uses are discussed in the sub-sections of 3.25 and in 4.631. It has the variants -A, -I, -U and -yU alternating as in the aorist form, i.e. -yU after bases ending in vowels, -A after most underived bases ending in consonants and after some (generally intransitive) formatives, -I after the -(X)b- causative suffix and -U with most other derived bases ending in consonants; see Erdal 1979b for more details. I am using the term ‘vowel converb’ as this distribution (like that of the aorist) cannot be summed up with a single archphonemic representation. E.g. inscriptional \textit{bodunumun ter-ä quvra-i-i alïm} ‘I brought together my nation and ruled them’ and \textit{sâlâyâ kâç-ä udu yorïdïm} ‘Crossing the S. I marched after (them)’. The vowel converb suffix can get fused with the verb \textit{u-ma-} ‘to be unable to’; when it precedes this auxiliary, its vowel is generally /U/ in Uygur also with verbs which otherwise have -A or -I.

It has been stated that the juncture between vowel converbs and main verbs is especially close, but the fact is that vowel converbs of early texts are quite independent prosodically (as in the examples quoted). On the other extreme there also are cases of incorporation, e.g. in nominalisations like \textit{körü kanïnïz} or \textit{ešidü kanïnïz} (q.v. in OTWF 354), where the suffix -(X)nïnïz is added to the complex verb phrases \textit{körü kan-} ‘to have seen enough’ and \textit{ešidü kan-} ‘to have heard enough’. Vowel converbs are sometimes part of the verb phrase, the converb being adjacent to the finite verb; they then do not serve as independent kernels for clauses. In some of these cases the main verb is in fact an auxiliary expressing the category of actionality or the like, an auxiliary of politeness (e.g. \textit{oğrunçülig sävinçülig bolu tâginip} in TT VI 458 ‘they – deferently – got exceedingly joyful’) or the two verbs have a new, fused meaning; see sections 3.25 (with subsections) and 5.3.
When considering the functions of vowel converbs one should also disregard cases of lexicalisation, when petrified converbs like yan-a ‘returning’ → ‘again’, moreover tap-a ‘finding’ → ‘towards’ and numerous others got into quite different parts of speech. The OTWF mentions numerous petrified converbs coming from secondary verbs, e.g. from causatives, which became lexemes in their own right. Classes of vowel converb forms or vowel converb constructions have, moreover, come to express grammatical categories, as the similitative case in +lAyU, perhaps the directive in +gArU or, in the verbal domain, the construction consisting of the vowel converb followed by the postposition birlâ which refers to events preceding the main event by a short time interval. In some cases, finally, elements by scholars like Bang or Gabain thought to be original vowel converbs never were representatives of this morphological class: Such are kud-‘‘down’ (dealt with in Erdal, 1991: 341) or tüzü ‘all’ (which is probably a simplex): As shown in Erdal 1979b, the vowel of the vowel converb suffix is strictly determined, mostly by the morphological class of the stem. Anything which does not have the appropriate vowel or for which no appropriate base can be made out is not a vowel converb.

In adjunct phrases such as ägîta ätözin ‘with bowing body’, külčirä yüzîn ‘with smiling face’, tîräyüünîn ‘with a shaking voice’, yaşru köglîn ‘with secret intentions’ or tikä kulgâkîn ‘with cocked ears’, the vowel converb is used adnominally; the head of this construction is in all cases an inalienable part of the subject of the verb. The instrumental suffix, clearly characterising the phrase as a whole, marks the whole phrase for its adverbial function in its context. tuga tâglôk kîsî ‘a person blind from birth’ in MaitH XV 6v9, U II 29,14 and 31,41, U III 76,13 and 77,20 is a different structure; the form here qualifies an adjective and not a noun (cf. tuga közsüt, same meaning, in the Middle Turkic Tafsîr).

In the following Mait passage, which is about an interpretation of dreams, we have further evidence that the vowel converb apparently did have non-adverbal functions with imperfect meaning: kim äv tâprisî ordo waxšîki ünmiš tûšamišî antag ârûr: ... nä tišläri tûshâ tûšamišînîg tûsh antag ârûr: ... kim oronluk yerkâ tûshâ tʃokîr] yulpunup tûshâ tüld körđî, ... nä ymâ ton kâdîntâ [a]drîlîmiş körđî, ... (MaitH XIII 4v7-19) ‘That she dreamt that the house deity or the palace spirit had left is as

\[502\] Some of the ‘ausnahmsweise’ instances in Gabain 1974: 121 are simple errors; tükîn-i (from TT I 126), e.g., is a mistake for tükîlî and opûl-î is in fact a -gAll form.

\[503\] See OTWF 770 with footn. 506 for documentation and discussion and cf. Röhrborn 2000: 271.
follows ... The result of her having dreamt that her teeth were falling out (tıuş-ń) ... That she saw a dream of the throne falling (tıuşń) to the ground and her bun disintegrating and falling off (yuplunup tıuş-ń) ... That she saw (herself) separated from (her) clothing ...'. The activities seen in the dreams and made the objects of the verbs tıuşń ‘to dream’ and kör ‘to see’ are expressed by the verb forms īn-miš, thrice tıuş-ń and adrl-miš; the first and third present the activity as having been accomplished while the instances of tıuş-ń may be presenting a view of it as still going on. Here, then, the vowel converb is used as a participle referring to an event, like the aorist.

A converb suffix ‘-čä’ has been read in BQ S9; a converb of this shape is postulated already in Thomsen 1916: 82-84, followed by Gabain 1941: 116 (§223) and Doerfer 1993: 30. This may in fact be a composite form, consisting of the verbal converb with the equative suffix; that would give the reading bol-(u)+čä in that passage and yogur-(u)+čä in Tuñ 26. boluća appears also in KT SW as completed by Matuz in Turcica 4(1972): 15-24, in the passage ħ b(ä)(i)m tég(i)n yuğ(ä)rü (or yuğ(i)rü) t(ä)ŋri bol(ü)ćä, where tänri boluća as well as yok boluća of BQ S9 both signify ‘after he died’. Tekin 1968 translated the passage őŋräki ār yoguručä idiþ ... ašdîn for as ‘having sent the vanguard forward as if kneading (the snow), we climbed ...’, and has adhered to this translation in his reeditions of the inscription in 1994 and 1995. Thomsen 1916: 82-84 had discussed the passage and interpreted the function of this form and the meaning of the verb correctly (apparently not noticed by Clauson since EDPT 906a is quite off the mark); see OTWF 755 (and 354) for the (quite solid) evidence for yogur- ‘to open the way, cross a dangerous or difficult area’, a meaning which Thomsen had already determined (although his interpretation of the clause is not, I think, satisfactory); it is probably related to yöl (thus in Tkm.), yoguč etc. and not to be confused with the verb spelled the same way signifying ‘to knead’. I would translate the passage as ‘After the vanguard opened the way (through the Sayan mountains, I) sent (the army) off and we went over the ...’. A converb

---

504 The form ‘thıćä’ in BQ W4 mentioned there should be read as āt-ār+ćä and has nothing to do with this converb, since it comes from an aorist.

505 He reads this as ‘yoguručä’ and on p.74 declares it to come from ‘yoguručä’ by haplology. While a haplology of aorist forms of the shape ‘Ur-Ur is indeed attested in non-canonical Uygur texts (see section 2.412 above), there is no inscriptive evidence for the phenomenon.
of this shape is not attested anywhere else in Old Turkic, but a construction in which this converb is used adnominally was mentioned above, and Uygur has the vowel converb together with the postposition birlä, which we mention straightway. Its meaning seems to be quite close to that of this one; since the vowel converb is attested in the equative only in Orkhon Turkic and with birlä only in Uygur, it may well be that the latter replaced the former.

When the vowel converb is followed by birlä we get a temporal converb phrase quite well attested in Uygur, discussed in section 4.633; it gives the meaning ‘soon after’. The relationship between the vowel converb and birlä need not have been one of government: As other postpositions in Old Turkic (and e.g. sonra in Turkish), birlä can govern zero anaphora, in which case it is, to all intents and purposes, an adverb signifying ‘therewith, together with that’. The construction in question probably came from a converb followed by birlä as adverb (similar to what may have happened with anîn as discussed above), giving the meaning ‘carrying out action₁ and (practically) together with it (action₂)’. birlä is, in this construction, often followed by the particle Ok (e.g. alu birlä ök in ET§ 16,62, “alth almâz”), since it describes events immediately preceding the main action; it is this immediacy that gets stressed by Ok.

None of these converbs is negated with -mA-, their negative counterpart is suppletive, using the suffix -mAtI(n). The runiform inscriptions have -mAtI in KT E 10, Toñ II E2 and ŠU E3; -mAtIn is spelled with t₁In₁ in KT S9, with t₁In₁ in ŠU E10 (fragmentary) and S1 and with t₁n in E28,2 (1.5 in the edition of Kormušin 1997: 80). The best explanation for the /n/ is that it is the instrumental suffix: That is, beside being a nominal case suffix, added also to the converb suffix -(X)pAn, to the case suffix +IXgU, to the postpositions birlä and öği and so forth. -mAkXzIn, a late equivalent of -mAtIn, is also, after all, in the instrumental case. Was there ever a converb suffix of the shape -tI?

506 The Old Anatolian Turkic converb suffix -(y)IcAk signifying ‘when’ could very well come from this suffix together with the particle (O)k.
507 There are a few exceptions, e.g. u-ma-yu in BT II 266, körmäyü in TT VIII A28, ıllımyâ in TT VIII A40 and Middle Turkic bulmay (thus?) in KP X.5.
508 Schulz 1978: 214 finds this spelling “merkwürdig” and thinks it may mean that the suffix was here to be read with A in the last syllable; in fact, implicit vowels can also be read as X in standard runiform spelling; What this instance means is only that the writer of the inscription apparently no longer knew the form -mAtI and could not know that the second vowel of -mAtIn had originally been a final vowel.
Some of the petrified formatives of this shape, discussed in OTWF 797-798, may in fact not have been related to any -(X)t- causative but be petrified forms of the direct positive counterpart of -(X)It; this may be the case e.g. with the conjunction ulla-ti, since ulla-t- is apparently not really attested in Old Turkic proper. T. Tekin 2002 wants to explain the suffix through the Tunguz verb of negation + a gerundial suffix -tI(n) which, he says, ‘is found only in the structure of the Uigur adverb näçökla-ti – näçökla-di ‘doing how, doing in what way or manner’. I think näçökłäti, näçökliati and kaliität were not formed with +lA- and a converb suffix but with adverbal +lA and +ti (taking these to have been distinct). Tekin is, however, right in referring to the Khaladj converb suffix -di / -ti, corresponding to common Turkic -(X)p in that language. The question of which alveolar -mAtI had is discussed by Johanson 1979: 137-139, Maue 1983: 55-56 and Tekin. It is always spelled as T in runiform sources and mostly as T in Manichaean ones as documented in Zieme 1969: 168. On the other hand, the Mait mss. edited by Şinasi Tekin, which are also quite early, have 19 instances spelled -mAdIn as against only 5 spelled -mAtIn. Brähmi sources show ilinmätin in TT VIII A28 but sö[zlä]šmätin (spelled with dh) in C11. The alveolar of kilmädin in TT VIII G44 is the character transcribed as ð, which definitely belongs to the phoneme /d/. In the DLT this suffix is spelled with dāl and not dähāl. In the QB, which also spells the suffix with dāl, we find not only -mAdIn but (twice) also -mAdI (e.g. bilmādi ‘without knowing’ in 4187). The Qarakhanid forms speak for [d] as intervocalic allophone of /t/ in this suffix, as these sources do not confuse the two consonant series. We adhere to -mAtI(n) as phonological spelling, noting that the phonic realisation of /t/ as [d] here probably holds not only for Qarakhanid but also for earlier stages of the language.

509 Johanson 1979: 21 thinks it is “eventuell möglich” that there should be a positive gerund [Ti] in the form [tökTi] in the passage tüü udimäti kântiix olormatix këxil kânim tüxüti kara türim yügürti esing kâçxiq bertim ëk (Tuñ 52) ‘Not sleeping by night and not resting by day, squandering my red blood and letting my black sweat run, I constantly gave my services (to the ruler)’, which, he thinks, could be tök-ti ‘pouring out’ or tök-üt-ti ‘letting get poured out’.

510 See section 3.134 above.

511 Among the instances he mentions, 23 have t, 4 d and 3 dd. The exceptions appear in Xw, TT II B and Pothi, which in other cases also occasionally confuse the alveolars; all three instances of dd are from Pothi.

512 bilmädin 634, yermädin 592. Spelled with ü in the late ms. in Uygur script.
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Forms formed with -mAkXzXn, a rather late suffix composed of the infinitive, the suffix of lack and the instrumental, are documented in OTWF 397-8; it is more or less equivalent to -mAtn.

There is a converb form in -(X)yXn,\textsuperscript{513} attested four times in runiform inscriptions, beside te-yin ‘saying; in order to, etc.’, of which there are nearly forty examples. This great number of examples for this particular form, in Uygur replaced by te-p with a different converb suffix, is not surprising: It reminds us of Republican Turkish diye which, in the same functions as Orkhon Turkic teyn and Uygur tep, underwent petrification.\textsuperscript{514} Among the other -(X)yXn forms we find süügüüg kandan käl(i)y(i)n sürä eltdi? ‘Where did armed (men) come from to drive (you) away?’ (KT E23) and kara bodun tur(u)y(u)n xagan atadi, täpirdä bolmiš el etmiš bilgü xagan atadi (Tariat S5; similarly S4) ‘He named him kaghan in the presence of the common people and gave him the title of “... kaghan”’. This form is different from the previously mentioned ones in that it can be negated: -mAyXn is found, e.g., in türk bodun xanïn bolmayïn / bulmayïn tavgaci adrölti. ‘Not being with’ or ‘not finding its khan, the Turk nation separated from China’ (Tuñ 2).\textsuperscript{515}

We again come across the form in kälmäyin anta ok tursar sän ‘if you do not come but stay right there’ in UigBrief C11, a late Uygur letter.\textsuperscript{516} Further in contracts in SammlUigKontr 2: alïmï larïm ma täli bolup turgu tâq bolmayïn kälïp yašïp ... (Mi19,4) ‘my creditors also having gotten numerous it became impossible to stay around and I fled and hid and ...’; oronïn yegin kälmayïn ädgü tutmayïn kudï asïra kish i... (Ad3,21) ‘if I do not ameliorate his position, do not keep him well

\textsuperscript{513} -(X)yXn and -(A)yXn are other possible shapes for this suffix; the former is preferred by Doerfer 1993: 26. Johanson 1988: 137 (n.15) spells it as -(y)Xn; this is not only counterfactual (since the /y/ is not dropped after consonants), it also contradicts morphophonemic structure, in that Old Turkic knows no ‘buffer y’. The participle suffix -yOk is a suffix starting with /y/ and not dropping it after consonants. The thoughts around this converb form in the n. to TT II,2 26 are obsolete.

\textsuperscript{514} This term is in order in view of the fact that the vowel converb is, in Turkish, always doubled when in living use.

\textsuperscript{515} The suffix is here spelled with n\textsuperscript{2} in spite of back synharmonism; this is not so surprising, however, as we also find hat-sïk+ïpa (KT S2; suffix -sXk) or yaqï+siž (KT; suffix +sXz) spelled with s\textsuperscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{516} The form kaygu < kadgu ‘sorrow’ also found there shows that this text had already undergone the passage d > y; most other intervocalic ds in that text belong to the Old Turkic phoneme /h/. Other late characteristics are the particle mA used after nouns (and not just after pronouns), tur- used as copula, +nl as accusative suffix for nouns, -gUl as suffix for the 2nd person imperative (replacing older gll under the influence of the contraction of -gU ol) and özgä (spelled with s) ‘other’.
but treat him as an inferior person; there is a further instance in Mi21.5. This late revival could mean that -mA-\((X)\)y\(X\)n got fused with -mAIn and -\(mA\)-\(yU\), perhaps together with analogy from the instrumental suffix. -mAIn lived on in Middle Turkic, e.g. in the Codex Comanicus forms \(ar\)-mayïn (150,4), yät-mäyïn (138,7), \(är\)-mäyïn and \(bil\)-mäyïn.\(^{517}\) -mAIn is unlikely to be behind these forms by itself though the /\(t/\) may have gotten realised as [d] even at an early stage, as the sound change \(d > y\) applies only to original /\(d/\). Johanson 1979: 138-139 is right in defending the view that -\(mAtIn\) and -mAIn are unrelated, against Mengers, Korkmaz, Brockelmann 1954: 253 and Ščerbak 1961: 160 and in connecting the former with general Oguz -\(madAn\).\(^{518}\) He also quotes the form \(a\(ðñ\)-mayïn\), with both /\(d/\) and the y-suffix, from the Rylands interlinear Coran translation (which supports the view that the two converb suffixes cannot have simply converged).

Cf. further -mAIn in bir kodmatïn tükä sanap altïmïz ‘we have not left (even) one but have counted and taken them all’ (Sa9,12) and tägmätïn in WP1,5, both in SammlUigKontr 2.

The converb form in -g\(All\) has two main functions, one temporal (discussed in section 4.633), the other one ‘final’; the final function (for which see section 4.636) is akin to the use of -g\(All\) as supine suffix (details in section 4.23). A few instances which appear to have consecutive meaning are quoted in section 4.637.

The negative counterpart of -g\(All\) is rather rare; examples are yogulmagalï (HTsPar 55 v13), atamagalï ‘so as not to pronounce’ (HTs III 399, in final use) or küsäyür män käntü özüm anïtmagalï ‘I wish I would not let myself remember’ (supine use).

-g\(All\) is also part of verb phrases, all discussed in section 3.25: -g\(All\) är-, -g\(All\) tur- and -g\(All\) alk- express actionality while -g\(All\) bol- or -g\(All\) u- express ability. Here again, as in some constructions just referred to, the meaning is neither final nor temporal but more similar to the English infinitive (as pointed out by Nevskaya 2002) or to the Latin supine; see section 4.23.

The meanings of -\(Gl\)m\(ð\)A, ‘as long as’ and ‘until’, make it likely that it comes from the formative -(\(X\))g with the 3\(^{rd}\) person possessive suffix and the equative case ending. This etymology is hypothetical, as -(\(X\))g

\(^{517}\) The QB forms bol-mayïn, \(kör\)-mäyïn and sëy-mäyïn, which were by some also thought to represent this form, are negated volitives, i.e. finite. This is also how they are translated in Dankoff 1983. The -mAIn(n) converb appears in the QB as -madIn(n).

\(^{518}\) Early Anatolian Turkish has -madIn as well.
is, in the language we have, not a flectional but a derivational suffix (albeit the most common suffix for deverbal nominals). It gains likelihood from the fact that we find \(+X)m+\ in the Nahju \(1\)-Farādīs when there is a 1\(\text{st}\) person subject, e.g. \(mān ḏūgūmēḥ\) ‘till I die’ (cf. Ata 2002: 90).

The subjects of \(-GInēA\) forms are more often different from than identical to the subject of the main verb. \(tūrgīnē\)ara in Höllen 21 has been taken to signify ‘as long as (they) stay (there)’. It is probably a contraction from \(tūrgīnē\)a ara, with the postposition \(ara\); the case suffix \(+rA\) unlikely to have been added to such stems. \(-GInēA\) ara is not attested, but we have \(būšūmāginē\)a \(tītmāginē\)a \(i\)kīn ara (Abhi 1398-99) ‘as long as they haven’t sent them off and given them up’. The quoted passage shows two examples of \(-mA-gInēA\), which would be incompatible with the etymology proposed if they were to appear in an early text. Other negative examples are \(uč yīl tūkāmāginē\)a ‘as long as three years are not over’ (P1,23 in SammlUigKontr 2) and \(bīlgā ārmāginē\)a (HTs VII 25) ‘as long as one is not wise’.

The meanings and functions of \(-GInēA\) are discussed in section 4.633 on temporal clauses. Two proverbs which turned up in very different sources have a different, comparative meaning for this suffix: \(ōkūz adakī būlgūnē\)a \(būzagu \)bāṣi bōlsa yēg (DLT fol.41) ‘Better to be the head of a calf than the foot of an ox’; \(mūḥ kīši yūzīn bīlgūnē\)a \(bīr kīši \)ātīn bīlgū (runiform ThS III a5 with the emendations of Bazin in \(Tūrçica\) 4 (1972): 37) ‘Better to know the reputation of one person than the face of a thousand’. This meaning of the suffix relates more directly to the usual ones of \(+\text{ēA}\) than the temporal uses of the suffix.

The subjects of the contextual converbs (see section 4.631) and of the \(-g\text{Alt}\) form are generally identical to those of the main clause, though there are some clear exceptions of various types. In this matter they differ from \(-GInēA\) and \(-s\text{Ar}\) but are similar to the secondary converbs.

Beside the synthetical converb forms we have secondary converbs consisting of nominal forms of verbs in oblique cases. The following all have temporal content and are therefore all discussed in section 4.633 as to their functions and uses: \(-d\text{Ok}+d\text{A}\), very common both in runiform inscriptions and in Uygur, and \(-m\text{š}+t\text{A}\), \(-\text{Ur}+d\text{A}\) and \(-GInēA\), none of which are attested in the inscriptions. \(-d\text{Ok}d\text{A}\) can also be used with the possessive suffix referring to the subject placed before the case suffix, as can \(-\text{Ur}d\text{A}\) and \(-m\text{š}t\text{A}\); e.g. Orkhon Türkic \(e\)lī \(k\)amšag \(b\)oltōkīnta (KT N3) ‘when his realm had become shaky’ or Uygur \(tūtsūg yūdīn\)
The QB also uses both -dok and the aorist in the locative case for temporal expressions. It is not, of course, evident that any perfect participle in an adverbial case form has to be an instance of a secondary converb suffix. Forms in -gU+dA, e.g., could be both a secondary case suffix and the mere sequence of -gU and +dA; more research into the actual distributions is needed.

The dative case is also used for forming complex temporal converb suffixes, with -dOk and possessive suffix in Orkhon Turkic, with -mAk and the possessive suffix in Uygur. Clauses around -gU+kA, on the other hand, have final content. -mlš+kA and -mA-yOk+kA serve as kernels for causal clauses, sometimes with possessive suffix referring to the subject before the case suffix. -mAk+InA also forms causal clauses and, like the other converbs in this function, is discussed in section 4.635. Clauses in which -mAk+InA has temporal meaning all have a noun phrase referring to a stretch in time as subject of the verb; that appears to be what supplies the temporal content, which means that the basic meaning of -mAkInA must have been causal. Limiting us to Uygur we could therefore say that the basic meaning of the dative when added to verbal nominals is either causal or final, depending on whether the nominal itself is factive or not, and depending on the nature of the adjuncts within the subordinate clause.

-mAk in the ablative case, sometimes with possessive suffix before the case suffix referring to the subject, also forms causal clauses, discussed in section 4.635. Causal clauses can further have -dOk+In, which has the -dOk form in the instrumental case, as kernel.

Comparative clause converbs are formed from nominal forms of verbs by putting them in the equative case; their uses are discussed in section 4.632. In this function we find +ČA added to the aorist form (already in Orkhon Turkic), to -mlš and, in Manichaean sources, to -dOk+ with the possessive suffix.

The construction -dOk+In ūčün, in which a postposition governs the -dOk form with possessive suffix referring to subject, the sequence -mlš ūčün and the aorist with ūčün are kernels of causal clauses and are therefore discussed in section 4.635. The quite rare sequence -gAll ūčün

519 Johanson 1995: 318 quotes olor-dok+um+a (by him spelled differently) as example for the phenomenon of personal converbs; this form is attested only once in the KT inscription where the dative may be governed by a verb signifying ‘to rejoice (at)’ (making the -dOk form an action noun and not a converb) and once in the BQ inscription in a damaged passage.
and the more common -gAllr üčün and -gUr üčün, on the other hand, forms final clauses, q.v. in section 4.636: The former are factive while these latter ones are not. Other nominal forms of verbs governed by postpositions, -mIš+IA or -dOk+dA with bärü, ken, ötrö or kesrä, have temporal meaning.

Secondary converbs very often have their own subjects differing from those of the main clauses. These are generally expressed by nominals in the nominative case, as subjects in general are; subject nominals of secondary converbs can, however, also be in the genitive case because the kernels of such verb phrases are perfect participles which, as nouns can govern the genitive case.

In general, the syntax of converbs and verb phrases is described in section 4.63 and its subsections.

3.287 The conditional

The conditional suffix -sAr has by some (e.g. Johanson 1995: 340, note 13) been said to come from the aorist of sa- ‘to reckon’; the aorist sa-r is actually attested in the DLT. It would be possible from the semantic point of view that sa-r should have been added to the vowel converbs of lexical verbs for (at first) asyndetic subordination, but there is no actual evidence to speak for this hypothesis: not a single trace for a putative converb vowel before the -s° within any attested form of -sAr.520

-sAr appears to have been pronounced as -sA already in some varieties of Uygur, on the evidence of medical and astrological texts, the collection of proverbs in the latter part of HamTouHou 16 or the rather early catechism in Tibetan script. In the Brähmi mss. of TT VIII, on the other hand, we have more than 20 -sAr as against only three -sA,521 which shows that the /r/ was quite real there. We consistently find -sA in Qarakhanid. The negative counterpart of this suffix has the shape -mAsA(r). The form är-sär serves as conditional conjunction added to full-fledged verb forms (e.g. uzun yaš adï är-sär `if he should have lived for a long time’ in M III nr.5 r 10-11 with a finite verb or in üd är-tüürürülär är-sär with a verb in the plural), to bar ‘there is’ and so forth.

520 The aorist being a participle, the idea would be corroborated by the converbial use to which ārkli and ārkän have been put, on the assumption that these are old -(X)gll and -(X)gAn participles respectively. This assumption is, however, vehemently opposed by Johanson, presumably because he does not believe in the possibility of a neutralisation between the phonemes /g/ and /k/ after /r/.

521 Two appear in text A; an additional one in TT VIII N 1 was reconstituted in the reedition of that text in Mār.
In the runiform inscriptions the conditional is a converb in that it is not directly linked with the expression of person; it usually (but not always) joins personal pronouns in the 1st and 2nd persons when these are subjects. When the -sÄr form is accompanied by subject pronouns, they follow it and are presumably clitic, e.g.: tïnlaglarnïn ädgü törüäriŋä tïduq ada kilmiš ärsär män, ... ‘If I have set up hindrances to the good habits of people’ (MaitH XV 1 v 13). Such subject pronouns turn up also if they are present in the main clause as well, e.g. ol altun taşka tâgsär siz, kök lenxwa körgäy siz (KP 28,1-2) ‘If (or: When) you get to that golden mountain you will see blue lotuses’. This was not, apparently, obligatory in verse quoted in DLT fol.201, where it suited the metre: apaq kolsa udu barip / tutar ärdim süsän tarip ‘Had (I) wished I would have followed him, taken him and dispersed his troops’.\footnote{At a rather early stage, though not in the runiform inscriptions, the 3rd person plural of the conditional was expressed by adding the nominal plural suffix onto it; e.g. mini tïg tımän tïnilgkyalar bolsarlar, ... (PañcÖlm 53) ‘If there were 10,000 poor creatures like me ...’; which also shows that the form appears also with an explicitly plural subject. This suffix can be shared by adjacent forms, e.g. muntakï yörügcä bişransar yorïsarlar, ... (BT I A 2 15-16) ‘if they live according to this interpretation’.

är-sär is linked to participles to give analytical forms; instances are listed in the UW entry for är- ‘to be’: with the aorist 401b (§17e), with the preterite 402 (§18d), with -mIš and -madOk 403b (§19e) and 404a (§21c) respectively, with -dAÇ 404b (§22d), with -gAy 405b (§23b). The main use of the -sAr form is conditional or concessive as described in section 4.64; this covers such meanings as ‘if; in case’, factive ‘since; seeing that’ and concessive ‘although’. In many other cases, the suffix has purely temporal meaning, for which see section 4.633. There is no overt means for determining which is the appropriate meaning in any particular instance, but the form is generally to be understood as temporal if it refers to the past. The use of -sAr forms with correlating indefinite and demonstrative pronouns to give a use which comes close to relativisation is dealt with in section 4.65. är-sär with non-correlating indefinite pronoun is discussed in section 3.134. In section 4.612 we meet -sAr forms in relative clauses introduced by the particle

\footnote{A later hand added a mûn under the line, changing the form to kolsam. From here it got into Atalay’s edition (who ‘reproduces’ the verse with the mûn in the line) and into Haoçeminoğlu 1990: 188. The widely used correct Qarakhanid form for this is -sA män, also proving the lateness of the addition.}
kim, whose main clause contains the element yok ‘there isn’t’. In section 3.27 we quote an example where kim ‘who’ appears with a -sAR form in a main clause with what appears to be dubitative meaning.

Some scholars from Thomsen 1916 to Doerfer 1993 have thought that there also was a conditional suffix ‘-每天都’, which Tekin 1968: 186 takes to be a gerund suffix. I have proposed in the previous section that the Orkhon Turkic words which can be read in this way be interpreted as vowel converb + equative suffix +每天都, as a precursor to the vowel converb + бирла construction, with which it is synonymous. There is no need to posit obscure suffixes if the data can be interpreted successfully by existing morphology.

3.29. The copula

The verb är- ‘to be’ is a fully conjugated regular copula; e.g. bay bar ärtim ‘I was well to do’ or сунчуклар yadişlig tölüçilig ärıp ... (BuddhUig 352-4) ‘the mats are spread out and ...’. UW 391b-409a offers an exhaustive documentation of this verb’s uses in (non-runiform) Uygur. A variant ер- is found e.g. in HamTouHou 18,2 and 6. Forms of är- may have been unstressed, like e.g. the forms of i- in Turkish; one indication for this is the contraction with н in n(а)ргатый (YE 41,8, runiform script), where the interrogative pronoun is sure to have borne full stress. Its positive aorist ärür is rather rare in the inscriptions, appearing once to refer to the future and in two other instances in a set phrase. In Uygur, positive sentences with non-verbal predicates unmarked for tense, aspect or mood often have ärür (e.g. bo mäni äk kesik ažunum ärür ‘This is my last existence’), but sentences without verbal copula are also well attested; cf. section 4.31. är- is used in various analytical verb phrases; forms coming (or presumably coming) from är- as арки, арнеч and арсар have become particles while арри ärür is used adverbially. армиш is added to sentences to express indirectivity.

bol- ‘to become’ is also a copula of sorts; it implies that the subject undergoes a change or a transformation in the course of, or related to the event being referred to; e.g. xagan bol- ‘to become a ruler’, kul bol- ‘to become a slave’, yaggi bol- ‘to start hostilities’, yok bol- ‘to perish’ and the like. ат(ы)г огрюнчулғб болуум (М I 6,18) signifies (in its context) ‘It has been a great pleasure’: If one has ‘become’ something in the past, one still feels the results; in this sense, bol- can, in the constative preterite, convey post-terminal states. bol- can also signify ‘to ripen or to grow’: bo tuturkan yalгуз [magad] елтә ök bolur, адә
[oron]ta bolmaz (HTs III 488-9) ‘This rice grows only in the country of [Magadha], it does not grow in any other (place)’. Kāśīārī knows this meaning and it is attested to this day beside the less lexical one. ‘Becoming’ is a content belonging to actionality: Sequences of lexical verb plus + bol- are described in section 3.251. When bol- follows -mīš participles, however, the phrase has a resultative content which is aspectual; see section 3.26. -gAll bol- expresses ability, a category discussed in section 3.253. One difference between ār- and bol- and other auxiliaries like kal-, tur-, yorï- or bar- is that the others are used as auxiliaries only when combined with lexical verbs, whereas ār- and bol- have just been shown to be in use by themselves as well. Moreover, the lexical meaning of those other verbs is sometimes quite different from their meaning as auxiliaries, which is not the case with ār- and bol-. Thirdly, other actionality auxiliaries are linked with converbs and not participles, whereas the verb forms with which bol-can be linked are participles and verbal nouns such as -dācīl, -gAn, -(X)gēī or the aorist.

There is a dream recounting mode characterised by verb phrases consisting of the aorist plus bolur, e.g.: tūšāmiš tūllā[r]īn523 ṭū ᵃp sākin[īp ᵃnca] tep teyūr: altunluk yerđā tūšār bolur. āv kutī waxšikī ʿinīp barīr bolur. bašīmtakī etigit tokīrīm yušunīp yerđā tūšār bolur. agźūmtakī üstün ʿaltn tīšārīm tūšār bolur. ātözūmtakī tonum etigim yokadur bolur (MaitH XIII 4r4-9) ‘She remembers the dreams she dreamt and says the following: The golden throne falls to the ground. The house spirit goes away. The adorned bun on my head disintegrates and falls to the ground. The upper and lower teeth in my mouth fall off. The dresses and adornments on my body disappear’. Other dreams are characterised in the same manner in lines 5 r1-4, 5-8 and 9-12 of the passage. Similarly in a dream of Xuanzang: ātōzin ketārū tāzgūrit bolur. nācā tāzgūrār yumā ol kīšīl[ār] ʿamru yakīn kālīp “yarīkāzun ayagka tāgīmlī” tep teyūr bolur. montag tūšavyī yatūr ārkān ... (HTs X 549-50) signifies ‘He becomes reticent; the more he does so, (the more) those persons keep coming to him and saying ‘Will his honour deign to ...’. While he was lying and dreaming in this way, ...’.

ol ‘that’ can stand for the agent with verbs which are neither in the 1st nor in the 2nd person. Sometimes, its only task seems to be the assertion of the nexus between subject and predicate; in that function it can truly be called a copula (as the 3rd person pronoun serves as copula in

523 Here and in a few subsequent passages I use such brackets to mark part of a word which I consider to have been inadvertently omitted by the scribe.
Hebrew and Arabic). It can, however, also denote existence. See section 4.3 and Tuguşeva 1986 for details.

While positive sentences with nominal predicate get either forms of är-, bol- etc., or ol or nothing at all to indicate the nexus between subject and predicate, negative sentences can have only verbal forms, ārmāz etc., to correspond to Turkish değil and the like. ārmāz is extensively documented in the UW entry for är- and in UW 445-6. A couple of details are worth highlighting. An example for a double negative is nāy tutsaklanmaz ārmāz (Abhi A 144a3) ‘It absolutely has to be grasped’. Then there are tag question type constructions; here a rhetorical question addressed to the king who is the object of the verb: elig bäğig öltüm madaar azgïntïn bulumuz ārmāz mü? (U III 69,14) ‘Haven’t we gotten the king from (out of) the jaws of death?’. ārmāz is used for negating verb forms also when a proposition is to be stated to be untrue; e.g.:

burun til ätöz ärklig alîr ārmāz ïraktikï atkangug (Abhi B 77b13) ‘It is not the case that the smelling, taste and tactile senses grasp phenomena at a distance’.

Also worth mentioning is the pro-verb-phrase function in elliptic clauses: In mān inçîp utî biltä‘î bolu täginîr mân; nāy utî bilmädä‘î ārmāz (U II 41,14) ‘I want to become a thankful person; by no means a thankless one’, e.g., ārmāz in fact stands for a 1st person verb. In birdämlig tanuklamäkïg adînlar ārmāz yanturu kântï özârî ök bulurlar (Abhi A 36b3) ‘The absolute evidence, in turn, they find only themselves; others do not’ ārmāz stands for the plural content of *bulmâlär. Similarly anîy içintä yânâ visimpat bulmîlär ärsär olar äşiqgâlî bolurlar; nāy adînlar ārmâz (BT III 738) ‘If there are among them such as have received ordination, they can hear it; others by no means’. There are further examples for this use in UW 406 (§28); in all these cases Turkish would have used değil.

bar ‘there is’ and yok ‘there isn’t’ fill tasks belonging to the copula in some other languages (like English); they are dealt with in section 4.31. In the following examples yok is used for negating adjectives, where one would expect ārmāz instead: ātözümtä‘î küçüüm tay adînîêg yok

---

524 ārmāz is here made into an entry; the motive for doing this seems, however, to come from German: I do not find any lexicalization in the examples quoted. Nor do I find any of the instances quoted in § b) to have the meaning ‘-los’, one of the meanings proposed in that paragraph.

525 Some more such instances are mentioned in UW 401-2 (§18a of the entry). The sentence I have quoted appears there as ‘bulumuz ārmāz mü biz”; but biz in fact belongs to the beginning of the next sentence: The speakers in that passage, trying to convince the king not to go to a certain place, are proposing to him to go there themselves instead.
(PañćÖlm 49) ‘The strength in my body is not admirable’; birök tapïg uduk yevïglïrï anuk bar ârsâr a[nî] üzä tapïg uduk tutguluk ol; birök tapïg [udug yev]ïglïrï anuk yok ârsâr (Abitaki quoted in UW 159-160) ‘In case their offerings are ready, offering is to be presented therewith; if their offerings are not ready, ...’. In the last example anuk yok is opposed to anuk bar, as if anuk bar were more assertive than anuk by itself.

yorï- comes close to copular use when it is used in the meaning ‘to live’: This is attested several times in the IrqB, e.g. otsuz suvsuz kaliy uyn, naçük yoriyin? (45) ‘In what way should I manage without grass and water? How should I live?’; ölümü sa ozupan ûgirë savinü yorïr (49) ‘Having been saved from death it happily goes on with its life’. Also e.g. ... yorïkîna yorï- ‘to live a life of (righteousness, etc.)’ in HTs VIII 83. The sentence ud âtözlüg, koyn âtözlüg, kîsi bašlîg yoriyur biz (MainH XX 13v5) is uttered by creatures in hell who have human heads but bodies of animals; it can best be translated as ‘We exist with bovine bodies etc.’ or, more idiomatically, ‘have bovine bodies (or) sheep's bodies (but) human heads’.

 te-tïr, the reversive aorist of te- ‘to say’, does not always signify ‘is called’ or ‘is said to be’: In didactic texts or passages, where it is common, its meaning often comes very near to that of the copula, implying doctrinal identity between two notions. E.g. bo tetir kertgünëni on törlüg yörügi (TT VB 128) ‘These are (considered to be) the ten meanings of faith’.

Another form sometimes appearing in near-copular use is turur, the aorist of tur- ‘to stand’: e.g. bo taš ärtïgä agïr turur (U I 8; Magier, a Christian text) ‘This stone is exceedingly heavy’; mini birlâ bir ugušlug turur sän (TT X 472) ‘You are of the same clan250 as me’; biz su bû körmiškaç iç(ä)n ûkäl turur biz ‘We are as well as one who has seen happiness’ (UigBrieffr C6, a letter). The same letter (C11) has the clause kälmaÿin anta ok tursar sän ‘if you do not come but stay right there’. This is not an instance of tur- used as copula but it shows the probable semantic source of that use. Kâşgarî expressly refers to the copular use of turur as such, giving the sentences ol taš turur ‘That is a stone’ and ol kuš turur ‘That is a bird’ as examples; he says that this aorist has no past form and no infinitive and signifies ‘he’. Arabic huwa and Old Turkic ol do, in fact, serve as copula. The DLT and the QB have further examples with turur as copula.

---

250 The adjective-forming suffix +IXg added to bir uguš ‘one clan’.
turur can sometimes express existence, e.g.: okışar män ol bitig içäftä ol künkä biziğ așda öľürgücü ud koyn toğuz başlap tönilglarniŋ savı turur (Suv 6,13) ‘When I read it, there were in that writing the words of creatures, mainly bovines, sheep and pork, which we had intended to slaughter that day at our meal’; kamag sansar ortosınta sab atlıg iǔ yığ ulug mını yertincü yer sylvlar tururlar ol iǔ mını ulug mını yer sylvlar otrasınta çambudvip uluş turur. çambudvip uluş otra yerıntı matyadeş uluş turur. matyadeş uluş otrasınta ketumadi balık ärür (MaitH X 4r11-16) ‘In the middle of the whole of sansâra there are 3000 great thousand-worlds called ‘earth’. In the middle of those 3000 great thousand-worlds there is the country called jambudvipa. In the middle of the country of jambudvipa there is the country Madhyadeša. In the middle of the country Madhyadeša lies the city of Ketumati.’ The passage explains why the speaker wants to go to Ketumati, the name of which was mentioned earlier. This explains why the first three sentences end in turur while the last one has ärür.

In isig öz alımçılari birlä turuşur osuglug turur (Suv 18,13) ‘It seems as if he is struggling with his angels of death’ the struggle is described as going on at the time of speech. This last instance appears to come from the use of tur- to express actionality (see section 3.251).

3.3. Adjuncts

The term ‘adjunct’ is in fact a syntactic one, not one referring to a class of lexemes. Adjunct phrases and adjunct clauses are adjuncts, as are e.g. nouns in the equative, the instrumental or the simulative case. This section will not deal with all these, however, but with lexemes which are adjuncts by themselves and not by virtue of a case suffix. Lexical adjuncts and interjections have neither the nominal categories of number, possession etc., nor the verbal categories, and are hard to define by morphological shape. Adjuncts do not refer to entities, nor do they qualify heads serving for such reference; they are not normally used within noun phrases (postpositions govern noun phrases but are not within them).

It does happen that adjuncts get case suffixes, as azu+ča ‘on the other hand, otherwise’ etc. with the equative or öni+n ‘separately’, birök+in ‘however’ and birlä+n ‘together’ with the instrumental. The equative and the instrumental are, however, the foremost adverbial cases in Old Turkic, and here just come to underline the adjunct status of the elements: The meanings of the quoted elements hardly differ from those of their bases, azu, öni, birök and birlä. The instrumental case suffix,
one of whose functions it is to turn nominals into adjuncts, appears to have been added also to form one or perhaps two contextual converb suffixes: -mAtIn from -mAtI and perhaps -(X)pAn from *(X)pA (which might be the source of -(X)p).

Old Turkic converbs, which are verbs converted to adjunct status, can also be governed by postpositions: There is -A birlā in which the vowel converb is governed by the postposition birlā ‘together with’, e.g., and -gAll ücün with ücün ‘for’, where the meaning of the final converb suffix and postposition support each other mutually.

ančip / inčip and ančaginča are formed in hybrid manner from demonstrative an+ča / in+ča, similar to Turkmen šeydip ‘having done that, thereupon’. No verbal stem as intermediate base has to be assumed to have existed to explain these; anča and inča are adjuncts as it is, and these are made a bit more specific by expansion with -(X)p and -(X)nA respectively; in principle this is not very different from the hybrid forms mentioned in the previous paragraphs. The forms are discussed in section 3.132 because of their stems; see also section 3.33 for ančip and inčip.

Suffixless nominal stems can also take on adverbial tasks: The stem forms of most nominals denoting space or time are found in adjunct use; e.g., in tüν udinatī kūntüz olormatī ... esig kūcūgbertim ők ‘Not sleeping by night, not resting during the day ... I offered my services’ (Tuñ II E1-2), tüν is a noun in the stem form while kūntüz must be derived from kūn ‘sun, day’ by an obsolete case suffix (preserved, among other places, in the composite suffix +dXrI). Any adjectives are, in principle, candidates for adjunct use, their meaning permitting: What is translated as ‘by’ in the translation of taloyka kiciğ tāgmādim (KT S3, BK S3) ‘I missed the see by a little bit’ remains unexpressed in Old Turkic. In KČ E8, another runiform inscription, the same content is expressed by the instrumental form kiciğın. The adjective / adverb distinction appears to be quite fuzzy.

Adjuncts can be repeated iconically, e.g. kat+iń kat+iń ‘repeatedly’ in HTs VIII 21.

Particles are here distinguished from the other adjuncts mainly by their prosodic and word-order dependence on the linguistic units which are in their scope. Postpositions and relational nouns differ from other adjuncts in that they govern noun phrases (in particular case forms). Conjunctions do not have single linguistic units in their scope but link phrases, clauses or sentences to each other in various ways. Passage between the various adjunct types is fluid in Old Turkic, words being often used in various tasks.
By function, the distinction between sentence particles and conjunctions on the one hand and adverbs as described below is not always clear, but nevertheless needs to be made: ārki and ārinč are listed as particles, e.g., because they have the sentence as a whole in their scope (without linking it to something). Another distinction to be used as criterion is that adverbs have relatively much, particles and conjunctions little lexical content.

Postpositions not governing noun phrases are adverbs, e.g. üzä or öni; or birlä ‘together’ in sentences such as biz ymä kamag ka kadaš Ketutmati kändä birlä enälim ‘We, all the family and friends, want to descend into the city of Ketutmati together’ or birlä yana törčimäksiz ... yokadzun ‘May (the sins) disappear ... together and without reappearing’ (BT XIII 13,128); there is another such example in HTs III 798. In nāčuk ol birlä [tojo] waŋ yudi atılıg xanlar (HTs VII 128) ‘How (does he compare) with the kings Tang-wang and Wu-di?’ birlä even follows a pronoun in the nominative case. ekilä, yana and yičä, all signifying ‘again’, are adverbs, but yana (which also appears as yânä or yinä) also serves as connective particle. udu in udu käliŋ (ŠU E2) ‘Follow me!’ or kamag dentarlar udu atlantilar (TT II,1 63) ‘All the electi got on their horses after him’ is also an adverb; a runiform instance of udu is, however, described below as conjunction. In azkya önpä yorçu turzunlar; män una basa yetdim (Suv 615,14) ‘Please walk on a bit; I will have reached you in a moment!’ basa serves as adverb with roughly the same meaning as udu. Originally no doubt the petrified converb of bas- ‘to press upon something, attack, come up suddenly’, we find it to be used as a postposition in the common phrases anda basa ‘after that’ (see examples in UW 145-6) and munda basa ‘after this’ or ärtmištä basa (BT II 1330). It then gets nominalised in basa+sín-da, e.g. in such phrases as basasında bar- or yori- ‘to walk after him’ (TT X 142-3 and U IV A 141-2 respectively). In az īnaru barn[iš], bir ögü[r] muygak kör[mış] (M I 35,7) ‘He went a bit further and saw ...’ we find īnaru adverbially qualifying the verb bar-: its use is here local, whereas the postposition īnaru governing the locative has temporal meaning. ara and utru are further elements serving both as postpositions or adverbs and as relational nouns.

ōtrō is a postposition governing the locative and signifying ‘after’; it also has a conjunctional use signifying ‘thereupon, then’, as in the sentence ... tep sakinmiş k(ä)rgäk. ōtrō ät’öz küzädgü tamga tutmış k(ä)rgäk (TT V A 53) ‘One must think “...”, then hold a mudrā to

527 basa basa has been lexicalised with the meaning ‘repeatedly’. 
guard the body’. Sometimes, e.g. in TT X 33, where it actually starts a story, ötrö is an element like the English particle ‘now’. Postpositions can govern anaphoric zero objects, in which case no explicit objects appear; it would be wrong to classify a use such as the one quoted as ‘elliptic’, as done by Gabain 1974 § 281: Old Turkic postpositions can serve as sentence adverbs, like conjunctions referring to the context. When – as in the TT X case – no reference to a zero-anaphoric is discernible, one might consider the two to be homophonous elements resulting from a functional split.

There are even clearer cases when the existence of homophonous adverbs and postpositions is only due to etymology: Take the postposition ötgürü ‘because of’, which presumably comes from öt-gür ‘to get through, to cause to penetrate’. The instance in sansïz tünän ažunta bürü ötgürü hökünki künkä täği (TT VI 015) ‘since countless myriads of lives, all the way through to the present day’ must be a petrified converb of this verb,528 but its meaning is still much closer to the verb than to the postposition. In adïn kišikä ötgürü satsun ‘he may sell it on to a different person’ (USp 13,11 etc., in civic documents) the best translation of ötgürü is simply the adverb (not the preposition!) ‘on’; this, again, comes directly from the verb and has nothing to do with the postposition ötgürü. Similarly we have, beside the postposition eyin ‘according to, in accordance with’ the common sequence eyin kâzigcä (e.g. in U III 10,10, 55,7, 67,2, 89,7) signifying something like ‘in the appropriate order’.

A different domain of fuzziness is that between conjunctions and particles, as can be observed with ymä: This is, on the one hand, a clitic particle even breaking into noun and verb phrases; on the other hand it serves as a conjunction introducing sentences.

The distinction between various types of adjuncts is fluid also in the sense that elements often allow several interpretations letting them get classified one way or the other. Discussing the sentence yagru kondokda kesrä aňığ biliq anda oyür ārmiş (KT S 5), Johanson 1988: 144-5 notes that kesrä could either be understood as a postpositive conjunction, as has been done hitherto, or as an adverb: Either ‘after they had settled nearby, they seem to have thought evil thoughts there’ or ‘when settling nearby, they are reported to have afterwards thought evil thoughts there’; kesrä either as ‘after’ or as ‘afterward’. I have already remarked on what seems to be the same ambiguity above, concerning birlä and ötrö; this should probably not be considered an ambiguity.

528 Especially because its meaning is not causative: See OTWF 403 (with bibliography) and the discussion in that work of the various petrified converb forms.
from the language’s own point of view, however, but a merely partial distinction between adverb and postposition. That kesrä can also be considered a conjunction has to do with the fact that clause subordination is, in Old Turkic, often effected in a rather nominal way, making an element a postposition on the syntactic and a conjunction on the functional level.

3.31. Adverbs

Adverbs are lexemes which serve as adjuncts qualifying the verb phrase. They come from different sources: +lA sometimes forms local or temporal adverbs (e.g. tünlä ‘at night’; see OTWF 404-405), petrified vowel converbs serve as adverbs (thus e.g. utru in bün utru yörüdüm ‘I marched forth’; see OTWF 741).

There is a formative +tI ~ +dl which forms adverbs from adjectives, as in bo savımın ädgüti äşid; katıgdı tüäl ‘hear my words well and listen to them carefully’ (KT S 2) from ädgü ‘good’ and katıg ‘hard’. Another lexeme formed with this suffix is amtI ‘now’, whose base lives on in South Siberian languages. There is an adverb tI ‘firm(ly), constant(ly)’ attested in HTs VII 1613 and ädgü tI, üküš tI, ulug tI, katıg tI, tI yavlak apparently are collocations involving this; see EDPT 432a for further instances. The formative may come from such a collocation. nätägläti, kaltI (both discussed in section 3.134) and bırtämätI ‘once and for all’ are formed with the combination of +lA and +tI.

There are two other +tI elements whose meaning and use does not quite permit us to link them to the above: One is ikintI / äkintI ‘second’, the ordinal of iki / äki, which appears with an +n in ikin ara ‘among (the two)’. Another +tI is added to an obsolete case suffix +dXr to form a group of local adverbs:520 üstürI ‘from above’ documented in the phrase üstürI kudI ‘downwards from on high’ several times in the EDPT and attested also in Mait 187r26, 197r8, 141 r17 and 75 v3 (üstürI örtülg yalınlIğ bI biçgyu öätätzIğı özI yagar ‘From above fiery and flaming knives rain on their bodies’); ičtırI ‘innerly’ in TT V A 55 and 95 and ArañemizIeme 77 and its antonym taştırI ‘from outside’ in M III nr.8 IV r12; kedırtI ‘from behind’ and its antonym ögdırtI ‘from before’ in one passage in TT I 122 and 123 and kedırtI also in Mait

---

520 See Röhrborn’s note to this for the Chinese equivalent.
530 +dXr forms appear also with personal and demonstrative pronouns in mintirdin ‘from me’, sindırtın ‘from you’, mundırtın ‘from here’ and andırtın ‘from there’.
67r11.\textsuperscript{531} +dXn nominals, üştün, içtin and taštin, kedin and öyduň, are related to these five. \textit{yağırti} ‘afresh, anew’, attested in OTWF 798, is probably not formed with this suffix but was a petrified converb from an unattested +(A)r- derivate from \textit{yağı} ‘new’. I take \textit{taširri} and \textit{taširrin}, attested in QB 3115, 5547, 5936 and 6259, to have been simplified from \textit{taširri} because of the three \textit{t}s.

Time adverbs such as \textit{temin} ‘shortly before or afterwards’ or \textit{ašnu} ‘before, earlier’ (originally the vowel converb of \textit{ašnu} ‘to hurry’) are a group by themselves, showing functional affinity to postpositions like ötrö when used absolutely to signify ‘thereupon’ (e.g. in Suv 194,16). \textit{kačan} ‘eventually, at some point in time’, is of pronominal origin. This is an indefinite adverb, usually appearing with temporal clauses; some examples are quoted in section 3.134. In \textit{kačan ol mogočlar bidilximka tægdilär ürşär ol yultz ütprämdäin şik turdä ‘When those Magi eventually reached Bethlehem, ...’ (U I 16, Magi, a Christian text) or in \textit{kačan küsüşi künguça ürşär ...} (Suv 362,14) ‘when, eventually, his wish reaches fulfillment ...’ it is used with the conditional form; in the following the verb is finite: \textit{kačan vuu tayşili ayä igaçin bulti, ötrö lovudi xan üşkintä utru turup ... tokuž älig şlok sözlädi} (BT I A I 9) ‘At some stage V.T. found his beating board, then stood up in front of the emperor L. and ... recited 49 gâdhäş’.

A particle such as \textit{soka / suka} ‘just’ turns out to have aspectual uses as well (like English ‘just, right when’); see OTWF 381 for some preliminary documentation.

It happens that adverbs are treated as nominals morphologically; from the temporal adverb \textit{ašnu} ‘earlier’, e.g., we have the case forms \textit{ašnu+ça} and \textit{ašnu+dın bärü+ki} (further expansion, +\textit{kI} governing the postpositional phrase). These and \textit{ašnu+sın+ta} are documented in the UW, whose author for this reason takes \textit{ašnu} to have gotten nominalised. \textit{öy-n} and \textit{birlä+n} are postpositions with the instrumental case suffix, while the base of \textit{azu+ça} is a conjunction. Cf. also \textit{başa+sın+ta}, \textit{yögüri+lä+da} and \textit{azu+sın+ta}, this is not really a question of this or that lexeme getting ‘hypostasiert’, to use Röhrborn’s term, but rather of the structural fuzziness around adjuncts in general, as discussed in the previous section.

\textsuperscript{531} A secondary form \textit{kendirti} has been read in Suv 10,9.
3.32. Postpositions

Dealing with the Turkic languages, scholars have distinguished between ‘proper’ and ‘improper’ postpositions, which both govern noun phrases. The ‘proper’ postpositions of Old Turkic (here simply called ‘postpositions’) are not inflected as such, although many of them are inflected forms of nouns or of verbs. Elements serving as postpositions can, on the other hand, be inflected if they serve as adverbs or are used in some other function; thus the instrumental ḏη+n ‘separately’ or adîn ḏŋîlârtô ‘in other separate ones’ (i.e. places’) (Suv 32,21). The ‘improper’ postpositions are, in fact, nouns from the morphological and the syntactic points of view, both diachronically and synchronically. Since they are not postpositions (and not themselves adjuncts) although they also serve as heads of postpositional adjunct phrases, we call them relational nouns. Relational noun constructions are dealt with in section 4.22; see section 4.21 for details on the use and functioning of postpositions.

Some of the (proper) postpositions are opaque like tåg (e.g. yultuçlar tåg ‘like the stars’). Others have a pronominal origin, like bârû ‘hither’ (e.g. in antáda bârû ‘since then’), which might be related to bân ‘I’ and bo ‘this’. înarû ‘forward, further’ is both a postposition and an adverb. Its base lives on in the case forms înê ‘thus’ and întîn ‘that side’, in încîp ‘thus’ and perhaps in the shorter allomorph of the 3rd person possessive suffix. îngarû in ŠU N10, the older variant of înarû, is clearly a directive of this pronoun. sîyär ‘in the direction of’ appears to be identical with the noun signifying ‘half’ or ‘one of a pair’ and may possibly be the dative form of an obsolete pronoun of the shape *sî (which may live on as the other allomorph of the 3rd person possessive suffix). sîyäru, which Hesche 2001 makes likely to have been a synonymous postposition in Orkhon Turkic, may originally have been the directive form of this base.

---

532 îcîn is a postposition which governs what we have called clauses, functioning like a conjunction meaning ‘because’ or ‘in order to’; cf. sections 4.635 and 4.636. Although such units are clauses from the functional point of view and although they involve predication, they still also have all the categories, and hence also all the characteristics, of nominals. îcîn therefore has the meaning of a conjunction but in fact governs these units exactly in the way and in the sense it governs other nominals.


534 Spelled thus and not as îgarû.

535 The apparent consistent frontness of the possessive suffix must have been secondary; note that monosyllabic nominal bases such as it ‘dog’ also get fronted.
Still other postpositions come from nominals: üzä ‘over; by (the use of), on the part of’ is apparently related to üstün ‘above’; alternately, it may come from a noun attested only in the Codex Comanicus (and possibly in Chuvash) with an obsolete variant of the dative case suffix (thus T. Tekin) or directive-locative +rA with subsequent zetacism. birlä ‘(together) with’ comes from bir ‘one’ with the adverbial suffix +lA.536 In later Old Turkic sources, birlä can lose its /r/ and/or be expanded with the instrumental suffix to give bi(r)län, öni+n is another postposition expanded with the instrumental. The instrumental case suffix is no doubt to be found also in ken ‘after’, which is related to kedin, kesrä, keürü, keç and keçä.537 In balık taštïn ‘outside the town’, a +DXn derivate (called ‘orientational’ and discussed in section 3.12) governs a nominative as a postposition; further examples of +DXn forms, governing the ablativie, are mentioned in section 3.12. +rA nominals such as öyä ‘before’, kesrä ‘after’ and ıcrä ‘inside’ are also locally relational like +DXn forms and govern noun phrases in the locative or (ıcrä) the nominative. osoglug ‘like’ is a +lXg derivate from osog ‘manner’ (normally, e.g. in U II 41.20, used in a binome with yap, a Chinese loan). yanlıg, which comes from a base copied from Chinese, has a very similar meaning and structure. tägliq, which is also formed with +lXg, is quantitative rather than qualitative. yanlıg survives as a postposition in Uzbek, tägliq in Turkish (denli > denli). Meaning, use and distribution show that these three are not mere instances of a complex +lXg construction but have fused and moved away from their bases.

Most postpositions were originally vowel converbs, e.g. körö ‘with respect to’, ötgürü ‘because of’, tapa ‘towards’ (e.g. inscriptional çik tapa yori- ‘to march against the Çik’ < tap- ‘to find’), aşru, togru (e.g. inscriptional kün togru süyüşdür ‘I fought throughout the day’, <

536 The function of this suffix is discussed in OTWF p.403-406. Tekin 1968: 110 thought that birlä was an -A verb from a denominal verb in ‘+l’ derived from bir, but there is no such denominal formative in Old Turkic. Gabain 1974: 136’s proposal of an -A verb from *bîr+i-l- is not possible either, as the coverb vowel of -(X)l- is not /A/ but /Ul/. The idea, in Gabain 1974 par. 295, that bîr(l)län comes from an -n verb of a denominal verb ‘bir+lä-’ is also unacceptable, as no such verb is known, and as bir+lä and bilän etc. are clearly variants of one and the same postposition.

537 Attempted etymological explanations for učän ‘for; because of’ have assumed an instrumental form, generally from uc ‘tip, extremity’; uc is, in fact, used in some such function in Ottoman. Within such an hypothesis, the only way to account for the front vowels would be to take uc+i+n with the possessive suffix before the instrumental to be the source. The possessive suffix may have been fronted also when added to back-harmony bases; one would assume it to have caused the fronting of the first syllable when the form got fused. Backward fronting is found e.g. in bókän ‘today’ as well.
CHAPTER THREE

togur- ‘to cross’), utru ‘facing’, tägi ‘till’. tuta < tut- ‘to hold’ attested as postposition in Abhi, signifies ‘concerning’. tägrä ‘around’ is by Gabain 1974 § 286 thought to come from a verb of täg-‘to convey’, but the vowel verb of this stem is /U/ and not /A/ and the meanings of the two are too far apart; the EDPT is probably right in assuming the existence of another verb *tägir-, which must also have served as base for tägirmi ‘round’ and tägirmän ‘mill’. Some conjunctions (e.g. yana / yänä ‘again; moreover etc.’ from yan- ‘to return’), adjectives and adverbs (e.g. ašnu ‘before’ < ašun- ‘to hurry’) are lexicalised vowel verbs as well.

kudi ‘down’ (e.g. sälängä kudi yorîpan ‘marching down the S. river’ BQ E37) comes from kud- ‘to pour’, liquids always moving downward. The form is not that of a verb, however, as that would be kuda; rather, it belongs, like tönä and yarašä, to the formation in -(I), discussed in OTWF 340-344. kudä is attested with /u/ in Brähmi script, survives with /u/ in Uzbek, Tuvän and Tofa and in ET§ 9.23 alliterates with seven other instances of ka. The postposition tönä ‘during’, discovered by Zieme 1992, is clearly formed in the same manner, as is yarašä ‘suitable for’. The vowel verbs from these stems end in -A and -U respectively.

adhä ‘different’, which can function as a postposition, probably comes from the base of adir- ‘to separate’ with the formative -(X)n discussed in the OTWF. eyin ‘according to’ could come from ey- ‘to pursue’ with the same formative or it could be a petrified shortened -(X)yXn verb.538 artok ‘more’ < art- ‘to increase (intr.)’, with a formative -(O)k dealt with in the OTWF, also serves as a postposition (cf. UW).

538 Gabain 1974 has iyin in §296 and iyä in §277, deriving both from the same verb iy-translated as ‘folgen’ in the former paragraph and ‘folgen, verfolgen, bedrängen’ in the latter. In §277 she also includes the phrase iyä basa which she translates as ‘ständig’. The two readings both represent eyin, with implicit vowel in the instances quoted as iyä, aläf and nüün looking identical in the texts in question. In the TT VI instance quoted, ‘iyä’ is found only in one ms. while another writes iyin, and in the U III instance YYYN is added under the line. eyin is found spelled 9 times with e in Brähmi texts and in no case in any other way, and onset e is never used in those texts to represent any other vowel in word onset. I now no longer think that the first verb in the biverb ey- bas- is to be read as iy-, as against OTWF 602-3: The Tekin proposal for reading Tes E5 is in any case too uncertain to make the difference. In ‘Bemerkungen zum lexikalischen Sondergut des Uigurischen’, an unpublished lecture held at the Frankfurt VATEC symposium (September 2002), K. Röhrborn expressed the view that eyin / iyin comes from a misreading of ävin ‘grain; single hair’ by being part of a loan translation of a Sanskrit expression; this seems unlikely to me, for reasons which cannot be detailed here.
The border between converbs (of transitive verbs) and such among them that have become postpositions is not always clear; the problem for the linguist is that both govern noun phrases: Gabain 1974 § 273 and 278 and Tekin 1968: 163, e.g., consider aša and kăćă to be postpositions signifying, respectively, ‘beyond’ and ‘beyond, across’. The sentences which they quote, e.g. kõgmän aša kirkiz yer ingă tägi s[üldimiz] (BQ E 15) ‘We crossed the Sayan and campaigned all the way to the land of the Kïrkiz’ and kâm kăćă ēk tapa sülâdim (BQ E 26) ‘we crossed the Yenisey and campaigned against the Čïk,’ give the impression that they are converbs and not postpositions. The examples with aš-a and tog-a refer to the crossing of mountain chains, those with kăć-ā to the crossing of rivers. Such words can be called postpositions if they are lexicalised in a meaning in any way distinct from that of the verb (e.g. tap- ‘to find’ vs. the postposition tapa ‘towards’) and if they are also attested in a way which does not call for a subject. With ögi ‘separate or distinct from’, there is a functional ambiguity as to postpositional or adverbial function discussed in section 4.2 below.

The common postposition sayu, presumably a petrified converb form from the obsolete verb sa- ‘to denumerate, enumerate, recount’, serves as a peculiar amalgam of ‘all’ with locativity; it signifies ‘to all, in all, at all places’: uluš sayu balik sayu kim bägläri … ārsär (TT VI 9) ‘In all states, in a cities, … whoever are their rulers, …’. It is still in use in languages so remote from each other as Yakut (ayi) and Krymchak and finds its analogue in Mongolian büri. Like the other postpositions governing the nominative, sayu as well governs the accusative of possessive suffixes; e.g. ay tägri käinin sayu ‘on every day of the Moon God (Xw 301).

tägimlig ‘worthy of …’ is derived with the formative -(X)mlXg dealt with in OTWF section 3.322. Beside the common ayagka tägimlig ‘venerable’, instances such as alkişka tägimlig ‘praiseworthy’, iki didimka tägimlig, ‘worthy of the two crowns’, mîn oğmâkkä tägimlig ‘worth a thousand praises’ quoted in OTWF show that Uygur had created a postposition of this form, governing the dative.

539 There does not appear to be any grammatical or functional ambiguity concerning aiku ‘all’, mentioned as a postposition in Gabain 1974 § 272: As shown in its UW entry and elsewhere, it is always an adjective (sometimes used adverbially, like many adjectives) and never a postposition; it seems more likely to have come from a contraction of the verbal nominal *alk-gu than from a vowel converb (as stated in the UW), because the converb vowel of alk- is /A/.
In Orkhon Turkic the noun yan ‘side’ became a postposition signifying ‘on the side of’; in addition, it follows synharmonism.\(^540\) We find it in kan+ta yan ‘from those around the khan’ (Tuň 33), bir+din yän ‘on the southern side’, öög+din yän ‘on the eastern side’ and yir+din+ta yan ‘from the northern side’ (Tuň 11) and tängrikän yän ‘beside his majesty’ (Ongin F5). yan shares the feature of adhering to synharmonism with the postposition täg ‘like’. In kan+ta yan and yir+din+ta yan in Tuň, the two Orkhon Turkic instances of yan where it follows vowels, these vowels are not actually explicit, which would be the normal spelling of vowels at the end of words (and often indeed at the end of stems); nor is there any punctuation mark before yan. From this it follows that the scribe actually felt yan to be a suffix. We cannot go so far, as this element actually follows the locative case suffix and as this would be the only instance where the locative form of a noun would be followed by another case suffix; but synharmonism does bring yan quite some way into that direction.

In the insessional pronoun sequences antag ‘like that’ (related to ol ‘that’) and montag ‘like this’ (related to bo ‘this’), täg also follows the harmony of the base. Note that the base of these two forms is the oblique stem and not the accusative form, which otherwise serves as pronominal base for postpositions governing the nominative of simple nouns. The same clearly happened to nätäg, which is spelled as one word though otherwise identical to nà täg, and gets expanded to give adverbial nätäg+in and nätäg+läti (cf. section 3.31). In the Orkhon inscriptions, antag still alternates with antäg, sizintäg ‘like you’ in the archaic Manichaean ms. in ChristManMsFr (r10, clearly visible on the facs.) must be another example for this process, since sizin+ is the oblique base while sizni is the accusative of this pronoun. In view of all this, +täg can be said to have become a case suffix as far as pronouns are concerned. In bintägi ‘someone like me’ in Tuň 57 (before Aylılmaz 2000: 110-111 erroneously read as ‘büntägi’) the base is also the oblique stem. The possessive suffix at the end is demanded by the context: A täg phrase gets a possessive suffix also in bars täg+im ‘my tiger-like one’ in the runiform epitaph E28,1; possessive suffixes are not normally added to postpositional phrases.

\(^{540}\) bağän ‘to me’ soğän ‘to you’ in Anatolian dialects and in Kazakh may possibly be contractions of the normal datives bağa and sağa with this element; I know of no other explanation for these forms.
3.33. Conjunctions

Conjunctions are elements joining clauses to their matrix sentences, linking sentences to their context, linking sentence parts or noun phrases to each other and the like. They normally precede the stretch which is in their scope, but ārkūn and the collective numerals (see below) follow what they subordinate. Conjunctions generally do not govern the elements they are attached to, but subordinating conjunctions like kim can be considered to govern what they subordinate. The postposition ʿūcūn can also be considered a conjunction where, in its causal use, it often serves for subordinating clauses; cf. tapīgē kirkīnlarī āgsīk kārgāk ʿūcūn (Mait 120r23) ‘because her serving maids were insufficient or lacking’, with ʿūcūn subordinating the predication as a whole. Conjunctions do not demand that what is in their scope should have any particular form. Many of the elements mentioned in this section are not conjunctions in the narrow sense, but all serve the task of in some way connecting. What follows is an unstructured and possibly incomplete list.

birōk and ymA are mentioned among the connective-adversative particles (section 3.342) and not among the conjunctions as their presence does not bring about subordination or coordination but is optional in these juncture types; their function is to make the logical, semantic or rhetorical relationship between subordinating and subordinated clauses (more) explicit.

Let us, here, first mention a number of coordinating elements: takī functions as coordinating conjunction signifying ‘and’. We translate muntada adīn takī ʿōji ās ācīgū yōk (Suv 610,16) as ‘There is no other or different food than this (i.e. than eating the prince)’, but use ‘or’ only because English demands such translation under negation. What is linked in the previous example are two postpositions; in the following example two nominal clauses having the same predicate are linked: ancāna kutlūg bo ūd kolo ... takī kutlūg bo yer oron kim ... ‘So happy is this time and so happy this place that ...’ (MaitH XV 6r5). In the following examples full verbal sentences are linked: bir ākintikā karganurlar alkanurlar takī ... okiśurlar (M I 9,11-14) ‘They curse each other and shout at each other’; amari tīnīqlar ʿaxrī āńīrār yīń āńīrār kentīr āńīrār, bōź batatu kars tokīyur, takī ymA adrok uzlar kāntū kāntū uz ʿīśūn ʿīśūyūr (KP 2,5) ‘Many people make wool or hemp thread, weave linen or woolen cloth and (in general) various professionals carry out each his special profession’. In some other cases (mentioned in the next section) takī must be considered a particle rather than a
conjunction; while the two uses clearly have a common source (see OTWF 340 for an etymology which accords with both meanings), these should probably be considered different elements synchronically. *takî* is not attested in Orkhon Turkic.

*yana* was originally the vowel converb of *yan*- ‘to return’; it appears with back harmony in Orkhon Turkic. Subsequently, in Uygur, it changed to *yânä* and *yenä*; *yânä ӧk*, e.g. in TT X 17, shows the new harmony class. It became an adverb signifying ‘again’ before it also developed a conjunctive function, then bearing the meaning ‘moreover’ (also in combinations such as *yenä ӧk* or *yenä ымай*).

*azu* ‘or’ appears already in Orkhon Turkic *azu bo savînda iğid bar gu?* (KT S 10) ‘Or is there anything false in these my words?’ In KöktüTurf TM 342 1 r 1-4, a runiform ms., there are two consecutive sentences both starting with *azu*; in such cases the translation should be ‘either ... or’. See the UW entry for Uygur documentation. *azu* cannot be the petrified converb of *az- ‘to stray’, as stated in UW 324a, as that is *aza* (cf. UW 319a for Uygur evidence for this). *azuča* (also documented there) has a similar meaning and use as *azu* and no doubt comes from it. Cf. also *azuśînta* ‘beside; on its side’ (attested only in HTs) and the even rarer *azukî* ‘secondary, subsidiary’.

*aðrmäsür*, the negative conditional form of the copula, serves as an adversative conjunction with meanings such as ‘otherwise’ or ‘however’; examples are given in UW 445a. In USp 24 we find *bol-**ma*-sa with the same meaning and function.

In Uygur, *ap* practically always appears in pairs of stretches, where it signifies ‘both ... and’; in longer chains its meaning can be given as ‘as well as’. See the UW for this documentation; in many of the instances *ap* is followed by the particle *yınä*. The UW also quotes one sequence of two instances in U II 4.2 where, after a sentence with a negative verb, the two *aps* signify ‘neither ... nor’. In the UW the U II passage appears as the only example for this latter meaning, but we find it also in Wettkampf 541 17-18: *bo tört savda adîn tusulmagay, ap aît aîrdâmînjiz, ap ��lîk baštîk âtûjîz* ‘Nothing beside these three words will serve you, neither your bravery nor your high-bred race-winning horse’. *ap* is used also in Qarakhanid sources; there, however, all the instances are negative: The DLT has double *ap* signifying ‘neither ... nor; in one QB and one Middle Turkic example, there is single *ap* following a negative verb and introducing a positive verb form, to be translated as ‘nor’.

---

541 Published after the appearance of the fascicle of the UW containing the entry for *ap*; the positive translation offered by the editors does not suit the context.
The source of runiform \(\text{ančip}\)\(^{542}\) and Uygur \(\text{inčip}\) and the documentation for \(\text{ančip}\) are discussed in section 3.132. The examples for \(\text{ančip}\) all show it at the beginning of sentences but not of paragraphs, preceded by -\(\text{dl}\) or -\(\text{mlüş}\) in the historical narrative of the inscriptions but by a nominal sentence in the epilogue of the \(\text{IrqB}\). \(\text{ančip}\) always signifies ‘having done that; thereupon’. This is also the meaning of \(\text{inčip}\) in the following passages: \(\text{inča sakıntıım ... mini ... dendar kilgøy siz tep. inčip antıkatalği mäniıp köüğüm nüg ornanmaaz}\) (TT II, I 40) ‘I thought you would ... make me into an elect. As a result of that my heart has not calmed down till now’. TT II, I is Manichaean; another Manichaean instance: In tümkä ärđim ärşär ymä \(\text{inčip}\) yana kamgæk käntirkä tayakligin köntülmüş täg boltum ärđi (HTs VII 1974) ‘Even though I was foolish, I had thereupon again become like the kamgæk plant which gets upright by leaning upon hemp’ the main clause of a concessive construction is introduced by \(\text{inčip. ant türc ölünür biz bilfür biz. inčip tükül bilgül töprü türşisi burxan kaçımüşüz köür bürz, no[mün aşidür] biz}\) (TT IVB 23) ‘Now we repent and admit all that. As a result of this we now see our father the perfectly wise Buddha, king of kings, and [listen to his teaching’.

In M I 16, 15 \(\text{inčip}\) appears to signify ‘similarly’: \(\text{amčukayu kalπi uzlar ädsiz nüg išläyü umaza, inčip ürlü uzuntonlugli nacjakatagı beş kür pr üçin yemäşär nüg aţoz savigın uventus išig sırũ umaz}\) ‘Just as e.g. craftsmen can by no means carry out their craft without material, similarly men and women can by no means carry out the shameless activity by bodily love as long as they do not use the power of the fivefold god’. In TT I 79 \(\text{inčip}\) appears to signify ‘because’: \(\text{busuš kadgu bälğüsi änirã turur; inčip âdğu kilinelijk eşlärka anmmaginçe ...}\) ‘The marks of sorrow haunt you; because, as long as you don’t trust helpful friends [you will not get rid of] (anxiety)’. Sometimes \(\text{inčip}\) signifies ‘hereby’ or ‘in spite of this’; the EDPT (mentioning a number of additional examples) also gives the meanings ‘this being so; so much for that; on the other hand; but’ and ‘then’.

The adverb \(\text{udu}\) ‘following, after’ has been derived from the verb \(\text{udt-}``to follow’, which did not survive in Old Turkic. In Tuñ 55 we find \(\text{udu}\) used as a conjunction: \(\text{elteriš xagan kazganmasar udu bän özüm kazganmasar ...}\) ‘If king Elteriš kagan had not won and if I myself had not won (either), ...’

\(^{542}\) In Saddh 32 (context fragmentary) the transliteration gives NCYP but should be corrected; the transcription correctly writes \(\text{inčip}\) (see facs.). By origin this word and \(\text{ančip}\) appear to be pronoun – verb hybrids.
kaltï ‘for instance’ does not itself normally create comparison as it is practically always used together with elements doing that: the equative case or the postposition tâg. With tâg it appears e.g. in kaltï yakï alkûmûš yula tâg (Mait 103v11) ‘for instance like a beacon whose oil has been consumed’, with an equative in îc yarîlak yolka tûsûgli âncâ ol kaltï bo yertûki tûprakça (TT VI 337) ‘those who fall into the three evil ways are (as numerous) as e.g. the soil in this earth’. In the last sentence kaltï correlates with ânêçä, in the following one with ânêçalûyur: saça utûntaçi kişîlär anêçalûyur bolur kaltï ... işi küdûgi bülmûyîk tâg (TT I 52) ‘People who oppose you are, for instance, similar to somebody ... whose business does not work out’. It appears with an aorist in the equative case in kaltï ... kûn tângri ornûnta yarok ay tângri yaşiyyu bûlgûrû yarlikarça eligimiz ... bûlgûrû yarlikadî (U 57,7) ‘our king graciously appeared ... like, e.g., the bright moon’s shining appearance instead of the sun’, with a demonstrative of manner in înêça kaltï tângri yerintä ... tugmïš ïn ûyir sakênur ‘he remembers, e.g., how he was born in the divine realm’ (MaitH XV 1v21). The following comparative sentence serves as a comparison to the one preceding it, whence twice kaltï: kaltï ol kişî ætözin bulûgû yulûklartà kertgûmê könjûllîg fînlîgler âncä ol kaltï tûrçak üzûki tûprakça ‘as, e.g., among people who acquire a human body, creatures with faith are e.g. like soil on one’s fingernail’ (TT VI 338). Finally, kaltï introduces converbial clauses ending in -(X)p or -sAr, with the same meaning: kaltï yûrûg taşûg alsar ‘if, for instance, one takes the white stone’ in Blatt, a runiform ms., where the author dwells on one of the stones after mentioning it together with some others. In M III nr.4 r9–v18 the human body is compared to the ocean which is jostled and shaken by winds coming from all different directions; the element kaltï appears in this passage seven times, five times with -sAr clauses and twice with noun phrases. In one of these the meaning ‘for instance’ is still acceptable; in amêcûla mâng(î)izîg ûrîrlär kaltï ulug tâl’ay s(a)mutre kim bulûgû t[âlûgûk]î ûkûs ol (r16) ‘They (i.e. all thoughts, feelings, forces etc.) look like the great sea samudra, whose whirling and jostling is great’ however, there is neither +cA nor tâg and kaltï should signify ‘as’: kaltï bo tört sav âgzanîzîda tûtsar siz, înêçî ulug takda munîda kurtulgay siz (Wettkampf 21) ‘Inasmuch as you mention these four words, to that degree will you be relieved of the great sadness and trouble’ apparently shows kaltï and înêçî in an early correlative function, these two elements originally coming from interrogative ka+ and demonstrative în+ respectively. See section 3.134 concerning the etymology of kaltï and some other meanings it has.
The postposition ötrö is discussed in section 3.32; governing a zero anaphoric and thus serving as temporal adverb it comes to mean ‘thereupon’. In an instance like the following, however, ötrö has become an introductory element (here translated as ‘well’): amatī bo savīg magat uluṣta ... bilmīš ukmiš kärgāk. ötrö [...] atavake yāk katīg ĭnin kīk[īrīp] ... tīnlīgelīrīgölūrgūlīugradī (TT X 33) ‘Now this matter has to be imagined in the country of Magadha, ... . Well, the demon Āṭavaka shouted with a loud voice, intending to kill ... living beings’.

kim is a subordinating conjunction placed before the clause it governs. In öttindīlar kim kalūrmī ārdīlar ışı tōrlīg közīnč ‘They said they had brought three types of present’ (U I 6.14, Magier) it introduces an utterance as an object of a verb of speaking (section 4.7). kim can introduce consecutive clauses (discussed in section 4.637), causal clauses (section 4.635) or final clauses (section 4.636); in these the verb is in the conditional or in a volitional form, whereas consecutive clauses have kim with indicative verb forms. bo yer üzā nāy andag t(ā)v kīr yālvi arviš yok kim ol umasar (M II 5.10) ‘There is no such trick and magic in this world as he would not be capable of’ is an example of kim used for the introduction of a relative clause (as described in section 4.612). The (Qarakhanid) QB also has relative clauses introduced by kim, with a finite verb or with the -sAr form.

apam ‘in case’ appears to have always been used with the conditional, mostly together with the particle birōk; see the UW for documentation. Unlike English ‘if’, its presence is not a condition for conditional meaning. However, as stated in the EDPT entry, -sAr also has non-conditional uses and apam selects the conditional one. QB and DLT use apay instead of apam. In case the Qarakhanid variant does not represent the original shape of this conjunction, its original meaning may have been ‘now’: I tend to follow Ramstedt (as mentioned in the UW entry) in believing it to be a derivate of *am ‘now’ with intensifying reduplication; the semantic process seems a likely one.

The postposed conjunctions ārkli (runiform inscriptions) and ārkān (the rest of Old Turkic) are discussed in section 4.633 and signify ‘while (being)’ or ‘when (being)’; examples for the latter are also listed and classified in UW 433–434: They turn sentences, normally having an aorist verb form or a noun phrase as predicate, into temporal adjuncts.

543 Living on in this meaning to this day in Sayan Turkic and probably eliminated everywhere else due to its phonic similarity with the noun signifying ‘vulva’. (In Proto-Turkic this noun may have signified ‘mouth’ and not ‘vulva’, to judge by its Mongolic cognate.) Old Turkic amtī ‘now’ is no doubt formed from the same base with the adverb forming suffix +tī.
The negative counterpart of positive aorist + ärkân is -mAż ärkân in Qarakhanid, -mAżkAn in Uygur. ärkân+ki is, however, made to govern negative aorists in two late texts, as documented in the UW entry for it. See OTWF 62 for possible etymologies for -mAżkAn (and cf. Bang 1915: 631-32), OTWF 383 for ärkân in general544 and cf. section 4.633 below. It might, perhaps, be possible to take it to be syncopated from *ärür kän (with the emphatic particle kAn); that would make it similar to -mAżkAn, in case this same explanation can be offered for that suffix (which see in section 4.633).

3.34. Particles

Particles are unbound elements of weak or no lexicality, which are not marks of grammatical categories either; they do not inflect but some come from inflected forms of other words. Particles are classifiable by scope and position. The term ‘particle’ is not defined by any syntactic task but by prosodic and/or word-order dependence of such elements on other words; particles can serve to connect, e.g., or fulfill other tasks. The border between ‘particles’ and what I have listed as ‘conjunctions’ is fuzzy, as elements such as ymä and biröö, dealt with below, show both clitic and clause-starting behaviour.

The emphatic element Ok, the interrogative mU and the late mat or mA are instances of postclitics. When such particles are joined to a clause or phrase consisting of more than one word, they can insert themselves within it after the first word, though their scope may be the whole phrase; e.g. ol ok oron in maytri bodisavt ol ok orontaolorup ... ‘The bodhisattva Maitreya sat down in that very place’. In kučmažkar mu äröö? (DKPAMPb 608) ‘weren’t they wont to embrace?’ or mini sävär mü siz (KP 6,4-5) ‘Do you love me?’ such a particle introduces itself into a verb phrase, before the auxiliary in the first case, before a clitic pronoun in the second. Other particles, e.g. ćok and ąyö, are proclitics. Clitic particles share the feature of phonetic dependence with affixes. What distinguishes them from affixes is that affixes are added to narrow sets of lexeme classes, whereas particles can generally be added to wide arrays of them; their scope covers whole words or even phrases. Unlike postpositions, particles do not govern their scope. They are here classified as emphatic, connective-adversative, epistemical and volitive.

544 Johanson 1994: 177 finds the view expressed therein unconvincing but has no alternative explanation. ärkân cannot be a converb of är- ‘to be’, as expressly stated in UW 433, as no converb suffix -kän is attested in any other word.
3.341. Emphatic particles
The clitic particle Ok emphasizes the word it follows. It drops its vowel when added to some elements ending in vowels, e.g. ḫčā+k in v 2 of the runiform ms. edited in SEddT-F I 542 and TT II.1 29, ḫčak (with dotted Q; Manichæan script) in M I 7,17, ḫčak and antak (the latter two quoted with numerous examples in the UW), ḥlurtāčık < ḥlurtāčı āk in Tuñ 11, ḥntlayuk in LautBemerk 29 beside ḥntlayu ok on l.43 of the same text. The fact is that ḫnta ok and anta ok are also common, the latter even more than ḫntčak. Uygur also has numerous instances where Ok regularly retains its vowel after bases ending in vowels, e.g. bo ok, munta ok, saja ok, ymā ok, yānā ok, antakya ok, körmištā ok, yarlīkamīsta ok and so forth. That non-elision is phonetically real is shown by Brāhmī instances, bo ok (TT VIII H3), anĩ ok (TT VIII D18) and ḥntgāhyā ok (TT VIII F14). Note, though, that āk in yānā ok is, e.g. in TT X 17 and 358, spelled not ‘WYK but ‘WK, in the way in which rounded vowels are spelled in non-first syllables; i.e. the scribe at least partly felt the two units to ‘belong together’.

Ok can apparently be added to any part of speech, as the examples above show. An example such as körmištā ok ‘the moment he saw’ just quoted shows that it can be added to temporal expressions; another such instance is bo nomka kertgünmiğü – ök ölüp bargaylar (1.28-9 of a text mentioned in footn.186) ‘Creatures who do not believe in this teaching will suddenly die right in the middle of their life’.

In the Tuñ inscription there are four instances of a particle kök, presumably consisting of (O)k Ok: In all the instances it appears at the end of a sentence, after a finite verb form ending in a vowel (e.g. ḥlurtāčı kök ‘he will really kill (us)’); it may therefore just be that it is in complementary distribution with Ok, a mere k after vowels presumably not being felt to be expressive enough.

čak is a preposed particle signifying ‘just, exactly, no other’: kim ārti ārki ḥlurtāčı – ogūkkyām – čak śini (Suv 626,20) ‘Who might it have been, my darling, who singled you out for killing?‘; there is a similar instance in BuddhKat 23. čak amn (Suv 612,20) is ‘right now’. Another temporal instance of this particle is quoted by J.P. Laut from the Hami ms. of the DKPAM in SIAL 17 (2002): 67: čak bo koloja ymā šakimunī ... sigun ažuninta tugdī ārti ‘Right at this moment, now, Śākyamuni ... had been born as a deer’. DLT fol.167 says that čak is ‘a particle expressing the ... exact identity of a thing’ and gives the examples čak
ol atni tutil ‘Hold that very horse!’ and čak amačni urgil ‘Hit the target on the nose’.

soka, for which more than a dozen examples are listed in OTWF 381, appears to have a similar meaning: Its Chinese equivalent signifying ‘geradewegs, genau, direkt’ is mentioned in the note to ZiemeLegenden p.152 1.8 (ms. filling a lacuna in Suv 8,1). Some of the instances have it together with ugrayu; in some others it is used for stating that something happens ‘right that very moment’: (suka sözläyü turur ärkän (AbitAnk 68) ‘right while speaking’. soka may come from sok- ‘to hit, beat’ (or from suk- ‘to thrust in’, in which case it would be suka). Unlike čak and kAn it is not added to time adverbs.

kAn is added to adverbial temporal expressions and appears to give them some meaning such as the one which ‘just’ has when qualifying ‘now’ or ‘then’. We find it with antii ‘now’ and aşnu ‘before’ (examples for both in the UW), ertä ‘early in the morning’, öğrä ‘before’ (cf. OTWF 62) and as yanirtu kan (BuddhUig I 227) ‘recently’. Then we have anč(a)gınčâ kan yärin y(a)r’udî kün tugdî (M I 6,19) ‘In a short while’ dawn broke and the sun rose; anč(a)gınčâ is a hybrid from an+ča with the temporal -glnčA convert verb meaning ‘until’ with perfective verbs, and clearly formed in analogy with that convert: kAn is attested with a regular -glnčA form in tašıkgınčâ kan ‘just until (you) get out’ (fragment quoted in a n. to BT V 521). The temporal form in -mA2kAn dealt with in section 4.633 may also have been formed with this particle (though -mA2 is not in temporal adverbial use as the words in the scope of kAn quoted in this section are). If one accepts this derivation in spite of the problem, one can not exclude that ärkän ‘while’ comes from *ärür kän by syncopation and assimilation of the two šs.

The emphatic particle mat is added to personal (sen in the QB), demonstrative (bolarni in ETŞ 12.6, bo 15,57, andag in the DLT) and interrogative (nätåg and kim+i in the QB) pronouns and to verb forms (three in -gAII, three in -dl and once the future in -gA in the DLT). It is always spelled together with them and may have followed vowel harmony, as assumed by the editors. If it did, it should be related to the second syllable of āvät ~ āvät ~ yämät ‘yes’ (DLT). This may link it to bar ‘quickly and for sure’ (DLT fol.161, TT VII 28,28 and 37, H I 23, 39 and 43), which stands before the verb.\footnote{546 Words of Turkic origin do not have onset /m/ except when the following consonant is a nasal, but another clitic starting with /ml/ is mU. mat might, on the other hand, be related to Mongolic măyađ (pronounced with [l]) ‘certainly, really’, attested from the}
A particle \( \textit{cí} \) is in Suv 34g,22, BT VIII A 132 and 276 and BT XIII 3,29 in conditional clauses added to the particle \textit{bírök} with no noticeable difference in meaning or function;\(^{547}\) in section 3.4 we find that \( \textit{cí} \) is also in Mait added a number of times to presentative \textit{munä}. In both cases \( \textit{cí} \) is spelled together with the preceding element.\(^{548}\)

\( \textit{ány} \) ‘most’ is preposed to noun phrases, e.g. in \( \textit{ány ínryä} \) ‘the foremost’; it is often spelled with two \( \text{alef} \). See the UW entry concerning its uses in Uygur. It appears to have joined some words following it in closer juncture: \( \textit{ány ír} \) ‘lately, recently’ with \( \textit{ány ír+ün} \) and \( \textit{ány ír+ki} \) are all spelled as single words, as quoted in UW 389a. Further cf. \( \textit{ány mínitin} \) ‘even’, which is often spelled as one word, documented in UW 388; note also that the very common \( \textit{ány ílki} \) ‘the very first’ is already in KT E32 spelled as \( \textit{ýr}+\text{ý}+\text{ý}+\text{ý} \), without the \( \text{I} \) which would have appeared before the \( \text{I} \) if the scribe had taken \( \textit{ány} \) to be a word by itself. Its synonym \( \textit{ány báš+la-yu+ki} \) also got fused.

The phrase \( \textit{ány mínitin} \) ‘even’ should probably also be considered a particle; see the UW for examples: It either qualifies sentences or clauses or (with a meaning similar to Turkish preposed \textit{ta}) phrases.

\( \textit{ayí} \) and \( \textit{kodí} \) as in \( \textit{ayí kodí ópkäsi kälip} \) ... (HtV 287) ‘he got exceedingly furious’ are in intensifying particles. \( \textit{ayí} \) ‘very’ appears to be shortened from \( \textit{ayíg} \) ‘bad’, as words like ‘terribly’ in many languages get downgraded to mere intensifying meaning. \( \textit{kodí} \) should not be confused with \( \textit{kudí} \) ‘down’.

Secret History on and in modern Mongolic languages (and borrowed into Turvic Karaim). The ultimate source appears to have been Sogdian, which has an element \( \text{m’t} \) (with long \( \text{a} \) ) ‘thus’; this is exactly the meaning given to \textit{mat} by Karaim. For ‘yes’ cf. the semantic development of Latin \textit{sic} > Romance \textit{si}. \textit{Bat} must have been created at a stage when onset \text{lm} was unacceptable. One or two runiform instances of \textit{bat} are not very clear. When Classical Mongol \textit{X} reflects the pronunciation \( \text{f}\text{á} \), as \text{happens in some of the instances, it is pronounced as} \( \text{f}\text{á} \) in Modern Mongolic languages, which is not the case with this word; modern usage may, however, be a case of pelling pronunciation, which also sometimes happens.

In Maue 1996 14,7, a brāhmī source, \textit{bírökci} appears in fragmentary context. Ottman \textit{eğeri}, which is mentioned in the note to BT XIII 3,29, was borrowed from Persian and has concessive meaning in both of those languages (cf. Turkish \textit{gerçi}). However, this opens the possibility that Uygur \textit{ći} was borrowed from some Iranian language, where it could have meant ‘what’; cf. Latin \textit{siqui, siquid, siquidem}., whose second syllable is a cognate of Persian \textit{ci}.

The particles \( \textit{ći} \) in the Mongolian Secret History and \( \textit{çU} \) in later Mongolian (best dealt with in Street 1984) differ somewhat from Uygur \( \textit{ći} \) and \( \textit{çU} \) (the latter discussed below) both in distribution and function, but may still be related: Uygur \( \textit{ći} \) appears in conditional clauses while Mongolian \( \textit{çi} \) became part of a concessive verb form. Cf. the adversative or concessive particles \( \textit{ći} \) in Khakas and \( \textit{ći} \) in Shor. Uygur \( \textit{ći} \) and Qarakhanid \( \textit{çU} \) differ in shape, function and distribution and cannot be equated.
All types of negation are intensified by preposing *idi* `by (no) means, (not) at all': *idi* ok+suz `with no interruption at all'; *türk bodun têmir kapîgka* ... *tägmiš idî yok ârmiş* `It had never been the case before that the United Nation'549 had reached the Iron Gate' and *idi yorîmazun* `by no means must they roam around' are all three from the Orkhon inscriptions and there are many more inscriptive examples. From Uygur e.g. *sizînâ idî bilmâyôkî kalmadî* (HT's VII 1802) `has certainly not remained unknown to you'. Gabain deals with this particle in the n. to l. 70 of her 1935 edition of a portion of HTs; she quotes a number of instances, some of which show that *idi* need not be adjacent to the negative element. She there spells the word as *'idî*` proposing to connect it etymologically with the verb *ûd* `to send'. This is rather unlikely, as the spelling in runiform sources shows d'. The only place where *idi* appears without an explicit negative is in a description of how the Uygur ruler Bügü xan made Manichäism his state religion. He there (TT II,1 44) says (among other things) *... ät'öz mânjisi ... közümü idî uênz yinîk bôlti* `... bodily pleasures ... became quite worthless in my eyes'. This appears to be negative *by sense*, in that *yinik* and especially *uênz* reflect a negative value judgement.

*näy* strengthens negations, signifying `(not) any': e.g. *näy kîginê bernêmôdîk* `he is said not to have given any answer'; *näy buajug yok* `you have no trouble at all'. It can also signify `by (no) means', as in *näy olar mamîka kêz uêcîn busanmazlar* (TT X 523) `They are by no means sorry about the girl Mamika'. I take this to come from *näy* `thing',550 discussed in section 3.134. No other originally Turkic words (except *nâ* `what', the presumable source of the two *näy*) begin with *hu*. HTs VII 636 has *näy idî ... yok*, linking two particles. In Manichaean texts *näy* gets contracted with (interrogative-) indefinite pronouns: *kimkä < kim+kä näy* is attested in ManErz 265,24 and, as *kimkäñ be[rma]ñ m(a)n* `I don't give it to anybody' in DreiPrinz 71. *k(ä)ntüni kimîñ näy körnâz* `nobody can see him in any way' (DreiPrinz 14) appears to show the particle doubly, once with and once without contraction. The meaning of *nää ärsär* `any' is similar, e.g. in *muçar nää ärsär yazôk yok* (PañcÖlm 23) `He does not have any sins’. Other preposed (probably a bit more lexical) strengtheners are *ârînçî, ançâlovak* and *arîti*. The last two strengthen negations, as in *burxan kutilig*

---

549 I do follow the semantic interpretations of Tezcan 1991 but there seems to be no doubt that the author was here using the term *türk bodun* to refer to the state in the name of which he was speaking.

550 As French *rien* `nothing’ comes from Latin *rem* `thing’ (accusative) and Latin *nihil* `nothing’ from *ne hilum* `not a thread’.
Not leaving off a bit in his wish for Buddhadom, he did not at all get tired ... of his task ...'.

3.342. Connective or adversative particles
The connective and occasionally topicalising particle *ymä* is often enclitic; in fact, it often breaks noun phrases apart, inserting itself after their first element. E.g., it gets introduced between a noun and a demonstrative qualifying it, as in *ol ymä ugrëda* ‘On that occasion, then, ...’ (Maue 1996 l. 3,96) or *ol ymä nirvan mágisi* ‘that bliss of nirvâna, now’. Further *bir ymä âmgâktin ozmatûn* ‘not saving (themselves) from even one pain’. *ölü ymä umaz biz* (MaitH XX 14r17) ‘Yet we are unable to die’ shows it breaking a verb phrase apart. The source of such behaviour, found also with *Ok* and *mU*, is not that the scope of the particles is limited to the first word; rather, it is identical to the phenomenon described for many early Indo-European languages by Wackernagel’s law, whereby there is a slot for clitics after the first word of sentences.

*ymä* can also be used in topicalizing function in correlative context, e.g. *bay ymä bar, yok çigay ymä bar* (KP 6,1) ‘There are both rich and poor people’. In the following example, a still different translation for *ymä* is indicated: *këltgëçi yiglayu barsar tegin ymä îglayu kalîr ärti* (KP 10,6) ‘When the beggars went away crying, the prince would stay behind, also crying’.

Orkhon Turkic has nearly 20 examples of *ymä* and none appears at the beginning of a sentence or of any other syntactic structure. However, at a post-Orkhon stage, *ymä* lost part of its its weak prosodic status. In the runiform ms. TM 342 2 r (SEdTF I 542) we already find *ymä bëri inçä temëš ... ymä ikinti âr inçä temëš ... ymä bo s[av]fîg inçä qzâmûslår ‘Well, one of them said ...Then the other man said ...This is how they argued about this matter, but ...; there are instances of onset *ymä* also in Xw 177-181. Cf. further *ymä uluğû tâpîrî inçä tep tedî* (Arañemji 1 a r1) ‘then the greatest among the gods said the following’.

*mA* appears to be a shortened variant of clitic *ymä* (cf. Bang 1909: 235) generally used with pronouns: E.g. in *biz mä uzun yaṣap ... ‘we also, living a long time, will ...’* in ChrManMsFr ManFr r 15; cf. *kayu ma oronta* (BT XIII 13,140) ‘at any place’, *nâçä mä ufîsa* (QB 1371) ‘however much he howls’, *nâgükä mä tîldamayîn ‘not taking anything as pretext’* (KurzeEinf 108: 15), *ąga ma ‘for that as well’* (TT VII 41,15), *kim mä yok* (BT XIII 2,75) ‘There is nobody at all’ or *kim kim mä ‘any person’* (in a contract in *Tûrán* 456, l.12). The well attested
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ancà ma ‘so much’ (normally spelled as ancàma) is documented in the UW, in one instance in correlation with inçämä / inçama; so is the less common ancûlaya ma ‘just in that way’, attested thrice in M I and also spelled as one word. I have met nâmä, which replaced nà in many modern Turkic languages, only in a very late Tantric text, BeidaFu T1 r2, A. Yakup, ‘A new cakrasâṃvara text in Uighur’, Kyoto University Linguistic Research 19(2000): 43-58; an apparently instrumental form nâmän was, however, read already in HTsBiogr 27 and 54. Cf. also nägûmä ‘any sort of’ (Adams 56,29) < nà+(A)gû ymä. ol-ok ma (M II 11,8) ‘that as well’ shows that the particle (O)k precedes the particle (y)mä when both are to be added to a stem.

In a letter (UigBrief C), reflecting spoken language, we find mä once after antî ‘now’ (which is, in fact, deictic like the pronouns); antî ma also appears once in another late text in TT VII. In the same letter we also have it twice after nouns, once signifying ‘either’ and once ‘and’:

aka enilär mä barîp körür kalmaç (9) ‘the elder and younger brothers do not come to see us and stay either’; yernî mä kârî kîşiî unûmîs bolgay sâm (12) ‘you will have forgotten home and your old people’.

The latter is less likely as -(X)p converses and the superordinate verb normally share their subject and there would be no reason to repeat the pronoun. Another instance of mA added to an -(X)p convertible is âtâkim yâdîp ma yûkû[ûtar mân] ‘I bow, spreading my skirt’.551

birök, signifying ‘however’ or corresponding to non-temporal ‘now’, is an adversative connective mostly found in sentences with the verb form in -(X)p; e.g. in correlative constructions: kim birök tägré buxrannay bir p(a)dakê tâñlg nom biîr ârsâr, ol kâlîp elîg bàçkâ söçlâzûn (U III 29,16) ‘Anybody who knows even as little as one line of the divine Buddha’s teaching, however, let him come and tell (it) to the king’. A number of examples, many of them at the beginning of clauses, are cited in sections 4.64 and 4.65 below. In MaitH XV 3v4 it appears with instrumental suffix, as birönî.552

551 What was read as xanna in M III nr. 35 r7, v6 and v8 was by Zieme 1969: 130 taken to contain this element and translated as ‘auch der Xan’. The context of these forms is quite fragmentary, however, and Le Coq attempted no translation. xan(ï)ma ‘to my khan’ or san m(ä)än ‘I am the khan’ are possible readings, since the fragment is written in Uygrur script.

552 This is clearly visible on the facsimile. If there are no additional examples for such an instrumental form of this particle, it may nevertheless possibly be an error for birökleri, with the element êl mentioned in the previous section.
**MORPHOLOGY**

*taki* is both a conjunction (see section 3.33 for that) and a particle: It is the latter when its content is temporal, with meanings like ‘yet, still’: In *sänräm takī bütmäzkän* ... ‘when the monastery was not yet completed’ (Mait 52r19-22) and *an bitigdă savī takī adirīp barmayok ol*; (Suv 18.14 + a Berlin fr.) ‘In the court register her case has not yet reached a decision’ the verb is negative, in *amīka täği takī bar ārūr* ‘it still exists even till now’ in BT IA 24) positive. As a particle it can further qualify gradable adjectives adding the meaning ‘more’ (or, with the elative-comparative suffix +räk, ‘even’ as in *antada takī yeğrāk* ‘even better than that’), stressing the elative. The bi-adverb ikilāyi tāki signifies ‘again’ when preposed to noun phrases.

*ārsār*, the conditional of the verb ār- ‘to be’, has evolved into a topicalising particle; see section 4.4. It can signify ‘as for’ or ‘concerning’ and is mostly added to noun phrases (including nominals, pronouns, numerals, participles); examples are given in UW 406b-407a. That it is a particle can best be seen in an example such as the following, where the accusative is governed by *sakīn* ‘to think’: *bo täri kīzlarnī ārsār birār yüzliğ ... sakīngu ol* (BT VII A 666) ‘As for these divine girls, one should imagine them as having a (different) face each, ...’. As a particle, ārsār does not appear to show any inflexion; ārsārlār in BT V 164 cannot be translated as ‘was sie betrifft’, e.g., as the editor does.

### 3.343. Epistemical particles

The particles of this section generally ask for information or signal what value the speaker is giving to the veracity of the proposition expressed in the sentence, what chance he sees for verification.

The ubiquitous interrogative particle *mU* appears, e.g., in *mini sāvār mit siz* (KP 6.4-5) ‘Do you love me?’. In Uygur writing as in this example the particle is spelled as MW and not MWY; we think that it followed synharmonism because its vowel is spelled as front in TT VIII H5 and 6: These two are the only instances I am aware of where it is found in front harmony context in Brāhmī writing. There is some discussion of the use of *mU* in section 4.3.

A particle *gU* (otherwise known from Early Mongol) is attested twice in the Orkhon inscriptions in KT S10-11 and in a parallel text in BQ N8: In the first case it follows the predicate it queries while, in the second case, it precedes the sentence which is in its scope. *gU* expects negative answers; see chapter V for more details.

*ārinč* ‘apparently, presumably, no doubt, obviously’ (runiform inscriptions and Uygur) appears at the end of declarative (not interrogative) sentences which are never indirective. E.g. *xan bodun*
tiliya korkup inca yarligkadi arinc (KP 11,3) ‘The king probably gave this order because he was afraid of what people would say’. In Orkhon Turkic there are twelve examples, all of them with past reference; one of these is a nominal sentence. Schönig (lecture at the VATEC symposium, September 2002) pointed out that the instances of this particle in the Orkhon inscriptions express respect towards the higher powers, whose activities and motives one does not presume to know about too closely. In later sources arinc appears to have been compatible with all tenses, as we find e.g. kantu bilingay arinc (KP 10,1) ‘I imagine he’ll understand (the hint) by himself’. Uygur documentation for arinc is rather limited (see the UW for examples).

The Uygur particle arki mostly appears in interrogative sentences, where it signifies ‘I wonder’; it usually indicates that the questioner has no hope of receiving a clear-cut and authoritative answer, either out of genuine doubt or out of politeness and timidity. In declarative sentences arki expresses doubt, to be translated as, e.g. ‘maybe; I guess, apparently’. Sentences like ence asan hay arki sizlar in a letter (UigBrief C5) presumably express a hope as well as a wish: ‘Hopefully you are well, in good health and in prosperity’. Exhaustive documentation for the Uygur uses of arki can be found in the UW; it occurs also in Qarakhanid texts. Cf. the etymology proposed for arki in OTWF 321.553

The DLT has several particles not found in Uygur or Orkhon Turkic. Thus, la (fol.538) is said to have been used by the Oguz (and only by them) to indicate that an action has been verified or completed; today it is attested in other (e.g. South Siberian) Turkic languages. Kasgar adds that the use of this particle involves a degree of denying what the addressee has said, implying that the latter does not know about the actual occurrence of the event.

553 The UW entry refers to the etymology suggested by Röhrborn 1998a to derive it from ar-gay, the future form of the copula. While I would not wish to exclude this as a possibility, the etymology does have some problems: A sound passage /ay/ > /i/ is not known to me (though particles could have their own rules) and the /k/ of arki is documented in sources in Indic scripts (as against g in argay); but that is not a decisive counter-argument either, as inflectional suffixes do tend to be less variable than opaque words (in view of alternation after /i/ in this case). Röhrborn himself mentions ‘koine’ examples of ar-gay with similar meaning (inelegantly trying to explain them away as ‘Schreibfehler’) and arki is, in turn, attested in such early texts as TT II.2, TT VI and Mait.
3.344. Volitive particles

The particle *gil* is commonly added to the 2nd person singular imperative and is used for emphasis. It is always spelled together with the verb form, e.g. in čaxšapılığ tőro yañ buzma arjama; təfrî yeriği bargu yolug ač; ńć tamı yolın to-gil (MaiH XV 13v13) ‘Do not currupt the teaching of the commandments; open up the way leading to the divine place; block the three ways to hell’. *gil* has hitherto been assigned to morphology, but it has no categorial meaning and is optional. It was rarely used with the negational affix -mA-, though we find (M III nr.12 r1) ʃ yañamagil ‘do not eat’ in fragmentary context, and e.g. kögil fiṣ.ımagîl (BT XX 948) ‘do not … your mind and do not turn it away’. *gil* may possibly come from kîl, the imperative of the verb ‘to do’. This would be similar to saying ‘Do come!’ in English, which (also) consists of two imperative forms. For this hypothesis to be correct, one might have to assume that kîl-originally started with a voiced velar. *gil* occurs already in Orkhon Turkic, e.g. in yâlmî kargu âdîgîtî urses (Tuñ I N 10) ‘Place vanguard and patrols properly!’ In KT S 1 we find the sentence sabîmîn tükâti âşîdîl ‘Listen to my words fully!’ where the otherwise identical passage in BQ N 1 only has sabîmîn tükâti âşid; the BQ inscription was erected approximately two years after KT. In a Manichæan text we have, e.g., sezig aytsar ìnća kîkîncî bergîl (M I 19,12) ‘If one asks …, answer as follows:’

The particle *cU*, documented in DLT fol. 535-536 (cf. Brockelmann 1917: 149-150) and also in use in some modern languages, also modifies 2nd person imperatives. Kâşgarî says that *cU* is used only in direct address and gives the examples kîl cû ‘Do come’ and barma cû ‘Don’t go’. He also (fol.537) states that one can use *š/U* instead of *cU*, giving the examples bargîl šu ‘Go!’ and kîl šî ‘Come!’. Another example of *š/U* added to imperatives is tušu (< tur šu), an exclamation to make donkeys stop (DLT fol.544). *š/U* is clearly a phonetic variant of *cU* (*š/5* being barred from the onset of original Old Turkic words); the fact that one of the DLT examples has it together with *gil* therefore shows that *cU* and *gil* must have meant different things.

---

554 In the Middle Turkic Oguz Kagan text we find *gil* added several times to the 3rd person imperative form.

555 Cf. Barutçu Özönder 2001; however, some of the uses of the particles mentioned in this paper go back to a homophonous Mongolic particle. The proposals of this author to consider the syllable “ča” in forms like ančaşu, bučaşu, the -čI in the future suffix -mčI etc. to be instances of this particle are, however, quite unacceptable for semantic, morphological and functional reasons. ČI (mentioned above) is a different particle.
The verb form *bol-gay* also became a modal particle or was on the way of becoming one; see section 5.1.

### 3.4. Interjections

(y)a is an interjection mostly postposed to vocative noun phrases, e.g. in *täğri oglı-yâ ‘O son of a god!’* (Aranemi I a r 2); *una amtî bîliğ toyûnlar-a* (Suv 643,17) ‘There, now know (it), oh monks!’ Uyugur examples of (y)a are dealt with in the UW as a, the very first entry; we therefore need not list any here. Most of the UW’s examples are vocative, which is also the case with an Orkhon Turkic instance: “bâglarîm a!” ter àrmış, “...” (Ongin F7) ‘He used to say ‘My lords! ...’’. In §2 the UW quotes two or three instances from the DKPAM where (y)a is used as an interjection for expressing pain, added to ängâk ‘pain’ or ängâk+im. This appears to be the main use of this element in the Yenisey inscriptions, most of which are epitaphs (written as if they were utterances of the deceased); it is exceedingly common in those sources, especially in the phrase äsiz ä ‘Alas!’; We there also find açîg-a ‘Oh bitterness!’, ökîmç-a ‘Oh repentence!’, bûy-a ‘Oh sorrow!’.

A second Yenisey function of this element was to be added to verb forms referring to an event one was sorry about. adrôldîm-a l adrîndîm-a ‘I got separated!’; azdim-a ‘I went astray!’, ogadmadîm-a ‘I did not get a chance!’, bûkmâdim-a ‘I did not have my fill!’ Vocative uses in the Yenisey inscriptions are eçîçîm-a ‘Oh my dear elder brother!’ in E32,11, oglanîm kism-a, ürûzîm karam äsiz yüz elîg ârim-a ‘Oh my sons and daughters, my white and black (animals) and my poor 150 men!’ in E45,7, bûgim-a ‘Oh my lord’ in E30,5, yàrim-a savaam-a ‘Oh my country!’ E152,3. After an /û/ Uyugur texts write a mere a, e.g. in elîglîr elîgî-a ‘Oh king of kings!’ (U IV A 103); after what is presumably /û/ there is just a in e.g. baxshî-a (DKPAMPb 1306) and vayšîr(â)vanî a ‘Oh Vaiśravana!’ (TT X 324 and 333); but cf. a m(a)xas(â)tvî-yâ (HTs III 779) ‘Oh Mahâsattva’. In Uyugur this element appears not to follow synharmonism, as we have a Brâhmi instance spelled bûg-a (TT VIII G 56); nor would we necessarily expect it to do so since it is not a suffix. In the Yenisey inscription E15 (dealt with by Erdal in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 56), however, äsiz-ä and äsiz+im-ä are spelled with the rare runiform letter for ã: The particle may, therefore, have had a different sort of behaviour outside Uyugur.

---

556 In U III 57,10, a male elephant addresses his wife as katunum subadra a; this could be an instance of this interjection used after a vowel without /y/ rather than a doubling of the final vowel of the name.
The §3 of the UW entry refers to cases where a is used for forming proper names (cf. the end of section 3.1 above); Röhrborn is probably right in assuming that this comes from the vocative use of a. The examples for this are quite numerous, but the author was aware of just one of them when he wrote the entry. In a document in Phags-pa script there is a proper name Savinä, no doubt to be understood as imperative sävin ‘rejoice’ and this element; this would speak for vowel harmony here.

The HTs III example quoted above also showed a vocative preceded by an interjection, a. Vocatives are more commonly preceded by ay and not a. The use of ay is described in UW 285a-286a. This entry covers various spellings such as ‘Y’, ‘Y Y’, ‘Y ’ and even ‘Y’, which could be read as ay, ây, ayî, ay a and ya respectively and be different interjections; Turkish, does, e.g. distinguish between ay, ây and ya both by sound and by function. In U I 7,10 (Magier) we have ây together with (y)a, in ây mogoĉlar a ‘Oh Magi!’. The element in question is in U I 7,10 spelled with one alef; in the following example the vocative element is spelled with two alef, whence my reading as ay: ay, kim sän? (U I 41,5) ‘Hey, who are you?’; cf. e.g. ay yâklâr in U IV A 25 and 61. It is not clear whether these are two different elements or a single one and, if it is a single one, if it is to be pronounced as ây or as ay; both spellings could, conceivably, be read either way. Whereas (y)a (discussed above) always accompanies vocative NPs, ay is, in this last instance, used by itself as an exclamation for calling people’s attention.

In TT X 301 and 409 ay and a are combined, in what are exclamations of grief: încä tep tedi: ‘ay a âmגk ğ ù ...’ ‘He spoke as follows: ‘Oh pain! ...’”; ay a aëğ âmגk ğ aî ‘O bitter grief’. ay a amר ak kağiçim-a (DKPAMPb 838, the same text as TT X; clear on the facs.) ‘Oh my dear father!’ is also a call of grief, as is an instance in Mait 117v5. ay a in BuddhUig II 296 signifies ‘come on!’, however, and an instance in BuddhUig II 397 expresses joyful surprise. In UigTot 98 ay a expresses the surprise of a person on finding out that he has been dead for a few days, in 201 the surprise at having been born. The UW’s referring to ay a as if it were a variant spelling of ay is unacceptable, as the presence of the additional alef is not explained. ay a could be a combination of interjections or it could be an independent interjection aya; in the latter case the space before the final alef could be explained by the need to avoid a reading such as ‘âinî’.

557 “a taşlanîk Oh, wonderful!” in HTs III 945 is a mistake for nâ taşlanîk ‘How wonderful!’: N’ and “ look identical in most varieties of Uygur writing.
UW ay III §A,c describes cases where ay is used for expressing sorrow. In Suv 623, 9, the mother of the prince who sacrificed his body for the sake of the hungry tigress shouts out *muŋ ay muŋ ay!* ‘Oh sorrow, oh sorrow!’ when she loses him and then utters a verb-initial sentence when she hears what exactly happened; later, when she sees the pieces of his corpse (626,15-16), she cries out *öŋi sac útilip yatur äy, kalmış sümpük yer sayu* ‘They lie scattered around, alas, the bones left over everywhere’. UW 285a-b thinks that cases where ay is postposed and not preposed represent Chinese loan syntax but it is hard to see how this can be proven: The positioning of emotive elements is notoriously variable. Here and in the next instance, uttered by the prince Mahābala when he sees the starving tigress, ay appears be used for attracting the addressee’s attention to a third party: *ay irinč tıši bars ünükkağalı yeti kün bolmış* (Suv 610,2) ‘Look, it is evidently seven days since the tigress has given birth (to seven cubs, and she is terribly hungry)’. 

ya appears in *ya kwotaw, tınlılarığ ölürtdiŋ ärsär ymA* ‘Oh K., even if you have had creatures killed, ...’ (Suv 15,10) and ya, *bökünkī kün ıntū baxšinniz šaķımun tämgr tämgrısı burxan ... ordumka karšımka kirii yarlıkdaț* (Suv 420,18) ‘Hey, today our teacher the Buddha, god of gods Śākyamuni ... deigned to enter into my capital and my palace’. These two instances are not sufficient to define the use and meaning of a particle; nor is another instance in an utterly fragmentary passage (BT XIII 5,213).

*awu* or awo is another interjection expressing pain, attested in MaitH XXIII 10v6 / Mait 75r17; cf. *awa* in DLT fol.57: *awu tesär, aricč muŋ tesär* ‘when (they) say ‘Ow!’; when (they) say ‘(Oh) pain! (Will nobody) intervene?’”.

yița ‘alas’ is especially common in the Yenisey inscriptions. In the EDPT this element is quoted in the entry for ayıt- because Clauson took it to be a verb form, but the verb vowel of that verb is not /a/. Since yița appears to have turned up only in runiform sources,558 the reading ayıt-a remains a possibility; ayıt would then be an imperative form of ‘to ask, to speak’, hinting at communication (by the shaman?) with the dead. The final a would be the interjection so common in those epitaphs, referred to earlier in this section.

äsiz, another Yenisey exclamation of woe, was quoted when discussing the exclamation A; it is also documented in the DLT as interjection and also served as a noun signifying ‘pitiable’.

558 What is read as *iňa* in KP 19,6 and *iňa* in KP 57,3 are not instances of this element; the first must be *inča* and the second a locative form as pointed out by Tezcan in TDAYB 1975/6.
tägrim ‘your majesty’ (lit. ‘my god’) is used for addressing male or female ‘majesties’, e.g. in nä sav ärki tägrim ‘What matter is (this), my lord? (MaitH XX 1r17). In DLT fol.199 we find this to have become tärim ‘address for princes and princesses from the Khāqānī family’. The appearance of the 1st person singular possessive suffix is similar to French monsieur, Arabic sayyidī and English as in the translation above; the semantic development is ‘lord’ → ‘god’ in English or German (presumably following Classical Greek and Latin) but ‘heavens’ → ‘god’ → ‘lord’ in Old Turkic.

muna559 (e.g. U III 6,1 and 42,16, TT II,2 80, BT XIII 13,112 and 138 or TT X 125 as completed by Zieme in his ‘Nachlese’ to the text) and ona or una are presentative interjections (like Turkish ışıte, Russian som, French voila), roughly to be translated as ‘look at this’ and ‘look at that’ respectively. The first vowel of ona / una is not known as it is not attested in Brāhmi or Tibetan writing; I do not know that it survived in any modern language. What morphological relationship there is between that and the pronoun ol / ani and between muna and the pronoun bo / muni is not clear. The Old, Common and Proto-Turkic dative suffix had a velar in the onset but one is reminded of the Mongolian dative. With these elements the speaker calls attention to an event which has just taken place, is taking place or about to take place, one which is imminent or about to be presented or to an entity the speaker wishes to be noticed: munamunĩbilmishkgäk (TT II,2 24) ‘This, you see, should be known’; munãamtĩbalĩk{i (fragment quoted in the note to TT VB 80 and in OTWF 55. The particle ma or mah which,
according to DLT fols. 493 and 539 signifies ‘Take it!’ or ‘Here!’; could be a contraction of *muna* (over *mna*).

In MaitH XIII 4r15 *muna* is followed by an element *čl* (discussed in section 3.341) spelled together with it: nā ymā įnča tep teyîr sîz oronlukum tüšär bolur? munači bo [...] oronlukumuz bo ārmâz mū? ‘Why do you say ‘My throne is falling down’? Here it is; is this not your throne?’ *munači* appears also in MaitH XI 7v13, XIII 7v13 etc..

*eš* is in the DLT said to be an exclamation used for calling cattle to drink; this is clearly the same as the Common Turkic presentative interjection of the same shape found in DLT fol.30 as eš mundag kil ‘Do thus’. akar közüm eš täjiz (DLT fol.289) can be translated as ‘Look how my eyes are overflowing like the sea!’; the use in DLT fol.332 is similar. *eš* became the first part of modern demonstrative pronouns such as *ešol* and *ušbu*.

Exclamatory sentences can be introduced by interrogative-indefinite pronouns such as *nā* ‘what’, *kač* ‘how many’ or demonstratives such as *anča* ‘so’, sometimes accompanied by *ymā / mA*; see part V.
CHAPTER FOUR

SYNTAX

Texts consist of sentences interconnected by certain, mostly coordinative principles to be discussed in section 4.8. Orkhon Turkic sentences have a close-knit internal government structure incorporating subordinate predications, but Uygur subordinate clauses are often linked with conjunctions. The question of loan syntax is a vexed one: Most of the Old Uygur texts are translations whose syntax can be expected to have been influenced by the source at least to some degree, especially when the translators were better versed in the source than in the target language. There are some texts, e.g. some written in Brähmi, which are evidently not even meant to be received as a coherent text but only as a word for word or even morpheme for morpheme rendering; these are disregarded here as far as syntax is concerned. Others can be difficult to understand unless confronted with the source: Chinese art prose style is borrowed e.g. into Xuanzang’s letters to the emperor copied into his biography. Many sources can, however, be – subjectively – judged to be ‘normal’ Old Turkic, if one claims extensive reading to have given one the ability to pass a founded judgement on this question; not forgetting, of course, that Old Uygur may have acquired some lasting ultimately foreign characteristics through contact. Loan syntax seems to be especially conspicuous in Christian manuscripts, e.g. oxšayur sân sân yaljuk oglî ol ingäkkä kim iraktîn üntädi öz buzagusîja kim azîp barmîş ârdî. nüçük isîdî ol bazağı őginîn inin, tärkin yügürtüp kâltî őgişâru, sezıgsız bolî (ChrManMsFr Chr r11-v3) ‘You resemble (VSO word order; first sân harking back to a language with verbal subject marking in present forms – like Greek), o son of man, that cow which (relativisation with the particle kim) from afar called out to her (use of öz similar to languages with analytical marker of possession) calf which (same analytical relativisation structure) had gone astray. As (= ‘how’, as in spoken German) the (ol, literally ‘that’) calf heard (again VSO) its mother’s voice, it immediately came running (VO word order) to its mother and was no longer afraid.’

One domain in which sources must especially have influenced our texts is word order, particularly since denotative content is little affected thereby. We will here disregard this possibility, for the following reasons: No research has hitherto been done on this matter,
because possible source texts often exist in several Asian languages and sometimes in different versions and because there does not appear to be much difference between texts we know to have been translated from different languages.

One important principle of Old Turkic syntax is that there is no automatic agreement in the sense that categories of one word in some construction have to be reproduced in some other word. As an example for this principle, adjective attributes are never for any nominal category inflected in accordance with their head. Redundant expression of a category is by no means excluded, however: Some nominal attributes are inflected in this way and can then be considered to be appositions. Plural agreement of numerals is common in post-inscriptional Old Turkic especially for living beings. Within the noun phrase we have, e.g. üç acarlar ‘the three teachers’ (HTs VIII 67). It is not rare (but by no means rule-regulated) for verbs to stand in the plural also when they have plural subjects; e.g. algo tínğlar mänîn yatîm ârmâzlâr ‘no living beings are strangers to me’.

Another important feature of Old Turkic syntax is the possibility not to fill out patterns. Argument slots opened up by verbs can be left empty, with two possible consequences: Either the context enables the addressee to gather the reference when the sentence itself does not supply it in some way; if context means textual context, we then speak of zero anaphora. If no reference is retrievable, another possibility is that the proposition is understood to hold for any entity appropriate to the situation, what is sometimes (wrongly) called ‘impersonal’. All this holds for all arguments including the subject. buluñ yınak kararîp körgâli bîlgâli bolmadî (Suv 630,20-21) ‘The corners (of the world) got dark and it became impossible to see or recognise anything’ is an example with unexpressed direct object which is not implicit either: That we have to add the word ‘anything’ follows from the fact that the context does not supply us with direct objects for the verbs kör- and bil-. In other cases entities not referred to should have been known to be quite specific, e.g. nädâ öttö ulug ânfâlyon bitig içintâ başlayu ay täyîrîg âgär alı kayur, âen ulug eîîg täyîrî xanî âzrua täyîrîg âgär (M III Nr.6 II v16-18 ‘Why does it, in the great Gospel, first praise and glorify the Moon (i.e. Jesus) and then praise the great king, the king of gods, the god Zerwan?’; The Manichæan Gospel (not to be confused with any part of the New Testament) was the first of the seven canonical works written by Mani, the founder of Manichæism. Readers of the text presumably knew that he was the subject of the sentence. English and
German\textsuperscript{560} can also, in such a case, use an ‘impersonal’ construction though the author of a work is known, if the text itself is in focus.

4.1. Nominal phrases and their categories

Nouns and adjectives do not differ all too much as to morphology\textsuperscript{561} but one might distinguish between them by use. ‘Nouns’ would presumably be used more as heads of noun phrases, ‘adjectives’ more as satellites; but instances such as agüči ulug+î ‘the treasurer in chief’ (KP 7,7), where the rather general predicate *ulug* ‘great’ is used as head are not rare at all. Attributive adjectives are not inflected for number, possession or case and show no agreement with their head. See section 3.1 for further considerations related to this distinction.

Nominal phrases are generally referential-denotative if they contain lexemes; if they consist solely of pronouns, they are purely referential. There are also non-referential nominal phrases, e.g., but in *but kötürkä tinlig* ‘a walking creature’, literally ‘a creature lifted up by legs’, or *kut* in *kut kołąnc* ‘prayer for grace’: *but*, the subject of *kötur*– ‘to lift’, and *kut*, the object of *kol*–, here appear within phrases denoting concepts. The phrases can (and usually are) then put to referential use but no such use is made of *but* or *kut*, which are parts of definitions.

All nominals and adverbs can serve as noun phrases, with or without attributes or other subordinated or appended elements. Since all sentences can be nominalised around participles, many subordinate clauses are also nominal phrases. Nominals can be qualified by other nominals as set forth in detail in section 4.12 and subsections.

The word ‘one’ is used as an indefinite article, e.g. in *antag antag yertä bir köl suvä sugulup ...* (Suv 603,11) ‘In a certain place the waters of a lake are withdrawing and ...’; *bir braman [ol] kuvaqta taštın turup ...* (HTs III 801) ‘a brahman was standing apart from (that) company and ...’. When the nominal is in addition accompanied by an adjective, there are two possibilities: Either the article appears before the adjective, as in *bir karči öküzüg ... kumursqa yemiš* ‘An old cow was ... eaten up by ants’ (IrqB, a runiform ms.), or it appears after it, as in *adın bir teva arži* ‘another devaş’. This alternation may be related to the fact that

\textsuperscript{560} Cf. “Weshalb lobt man im großen Evangelium, ...” in the translation of the sentence in UW 95b under *alka- 1). The word I have spelled as *äŋ(ə)lyon* is not mentioned in the UW either under *ap*" or under *ap*"; the main variant, borrowed from Sugdian, may have started with *ap*" but there should at least have been a cross-reference.

\textsuperscript{561} See section 3.1.
kari is more of a lexical complement to the head than ‘other’, which is referential. There is no definite article, and definiteness is not grammaticalised in any clearly definable manner. Other categories of nominal phrases are possession, number and case. The functioning of the first two of these is described together with their morphology, the expression modalities for possession also in section 4.121.

4.11. Case functions

The case forms themselves are discussed in section 3.124. All case suffixes have a number of functions and it is often difficult to see a coherent whole in them; sometimes, as with the dative, these functions and meanings are practically each others’ opposites. We will here deal with the functions case by case, not by their semantics.

The cases which can be used adnominally are the nominative, the genitive and the directive-locative; the equative is so used when it expresses an approximation.

One problem to be mentioned here is a question around verbal nouns and the like in oblique case forms; should -gU+kA or -mAk+kA be considered to be complex converb suffixes or should they be discussed as dative forms? This depends mainly on whether the suffix sequence has evolved a life of its own and gained its paradigmatic place in the verbal system; in this case it is dealt with as a complex converb suffix. Finding a straightforward answer to this question is not always easy.

4.1101. The nominative

The stem unmarked for case could be used in all functions otherwise expressed by the common case suffixes, except, apparently, (concrete or abstract) motion towards and motion from a point.\textsuperscript{562} In principle, at least, case suffixes can be taken to have originally been (with the just mentioned limitation) as facultative as the other nominal category morphemes: the plural suffix(es) with plural entities, the possessive suffixes with possessed entities and the antonymy and parallelism marker with elements used in parallelism. When context and lexical meaning made the case function of a noun phrase clear, the speaker apparently could, if he had no wish to stress this function, omit its case marker.

\textsuperscript{562} However, the phrase altun soja kālīp ‘coming to Altun Soja’ may possibly have to be read in l.3 of the Yenisey inscription E38, an Altun Soja yīsī being mentioned also in E28 C 3.
The function of the nominative as subject is well known. In bilgä tuñokok bän özüm tavgač elığä kilṁtim (Tuñ W1) ‘I, T. the wise, was myself born (or educated) in China’ bilgä tuñokok can be considered the topic of the sentence, the rest of the sentence being predicated upon this topic. In the following instance word order shows the nominative subject not to be the topic but the predicate: bo taška ... kop yolług tegin bitidim (KT SE) ‘Everything on this stone I, Y. T., have written’.

In Bilgä Xagan bo üdkä olortum (KT S1) the noun phrase Bilgä Xagan should also be considered to be the subject of olortum ‘I reigned’ though this verb is in the 1st person. This is possible in some languages, one condition being that there are verb forms inflecting for person. About the sentence üküš türk bodun öltül in KT S6 Grønbech 1936: 136 writes: “Wörtlich läßt sich der oben zitierte Satz gar nicht ins Deutsche übertragen. Dem Sinne nach könnte man ihn etwa wiedergeben: ‘Viele von dir, o Türkenvolk, sind gestorben.’”: a nominal subject for a 2nd person verb is unthinkable in German. In sü barĩğ teğı (Tuñ 31) ‘He said “Army go!”’, sü could, of course, be either a vocative or the subject of a 2nd person verb. In the 1st person plural, finally, we have the following: oguzgaru sü taşi kıdimiş; ‘We / I and the army moved out towards the Oguz’ is here the best translation. Another possibility would be that, in sü yoriyin ‘I intend to draw into the field with my army’ and sü taşi kıdimiş ‘We (the army and I) set out into the field’, sü has sociative meaning, yori- and taşi- being intransitive verbs. Or else, sü yori- and sü taşi- are lexicalised verb phrases of military language, so that the bracketing (sü yori)-yin and (sü taşi)-dınız would be possible, getting transferred from the 3rd to the other persons.

The nominative is used for address, e.g. türk bodun in tăğri basmasar, yer tălinması, türk bodun, elını törögün kăm artki uđaci ārti? (KT IE22) ‘As long as the sky did not press down (upon you and) the earth did not open (beneath you), oh Turk nation, who could have been able to destroy your land and your government?’ or üdjği tınağlar in körığlar üdjği tınağlar ‘See, good creatures!’ (MaitH XX 13v3). When it precedes a sentence, a vocative nominative is often coupled with a vocative particle; see section 3.4.

The use of nominative adjectives within predications, as in amrak oglım, nā üçin busuşiğ kăltınjiz? ‘My dear son, why have you come in sadness?’ (KP 4,5), should also be noted. Such predicative adjectives can even have their own nominal topic, as in közi yümğiş olorur ārti ‘He used to sit with closed eyes’ (HTs VI 2b9).
The nominative case is also used for nominals denoting things the subject of the verb will become, as tüyür böšük boluşup... bagır bösük äðgï oglı bolurlar (TT VI 308-9) ‘They become each others’ brothers - and sisters-in-law and become friends and well-wishers’. Perhaps unexpectedly, this construction is also used with the verb ‘to appear’, as in šakümüni atlıg burxan yertenêädä bälgürgäy sän (Laut 26) ‘You will appear in the world as the buddha called Šäkyamuni’ or alp bulguluk burxan yer suvda bälgürmış äürür siz (MaitH XV 11r23) ‘you have appeared in the world as a buddha hard to encounter; there is no need for any Turkic counterpart of ‘as’.

The nominative is further used in adnominal constructions in which the genitive is also used, as described in section 4.121; the semantic content of the relationship is rarely related to actual ‘possession’, although the term possessive construction is generally used for it: One example is oglum savï in KP 63,2 which, in its context, signifies ‘news from my son’ or ‘about my son’; note that there is here no case suffix although the satellite is quite definite and specific. Other implicit semantic relationships of this construction have to do with ‘part – whole’, ‘place’ or ‘assignment’.

Direct objects often appear without accusative suffix without being confined to preverbal position (as e.g. in Turkish); e.g.: turkaru aš içgï inca kołosîncä ašanmak kärgäk (M III nr.6, 12.3.) ‘It is necessary to have one’s meals thus, at the right times’. In the inscriptions we find yälmä kargu ädgüti urgence (Tuñ 34) ‘Place (the) vanguard and watch-towers well!’ or xagan at bunta böz bertimiz (KT E20) ‘It was we who gave (him) the title ‘kagan’ on this occasion’. BQ E 17, which is parallel to KT E20, here writes accusative xagan atlig; the scribe of the BQ may have felt there was here something he wanted to change, but the KT text cannot, nevertheless, be considered to be incorrect. The absence of the accusative suffix is not related to non-specificity, e.g. kara kumaš mïš ‘They had crossed the Kara-Kum (desert, mentioned also in Tuñ 7)’ (Š U N8) or (in Uygur) bo nom bititimış oglı Ärdini bititdä (ECT=U:ALVCW?MGENJ’FH=K) ‘the lay brother K.O, who has this holy Jewel written down’ or bo tört sav ağızda tut- (Wettkampf 27 and 30) ‘to repeat these four words’. With possessive suffix, ağır ayığ kîlmclarım ikîlçü tåg tîlmä män (SuvSündenbek 75) ‘I will not repeat my gravely evil

563 In an instance like bo yarlıg ešidip (KP 18,8) ‘having heard this order’, on the other hand, yarlıg could also have been simplified from accusative yarlıg-vig; cf. yîglîg < *yîg-îglîg in Abhi B 1404.
deeds’, köşüllümüz amirtgurup (TT II,1 72-73) ‘calming our hearts’, külümüz bir ikini birlâ sinalım (Wettkampf 41) ‘Let us test each other’s strength’, atüy atayu ‘calling out your name’ (TT I 116) or öz kartü kartay ‘Treat your own wound!’ (DLT fol. 390). In the following example from IrqB LIV (one of the beautiful instances of man–nature parallelism in that text) the suffix in savi can only be the possessive suffix, and the two instances can only be direct objects: kul savi bağşarû ötmünur, kazgun savi tâyrigårû yavvarur ‘The servant adresses his words to his master; the raven prays his words to the sky (or to the god)’. Similarly in tamu yolî tudajuz (Pothi 14) ‘You have blocked the way to hell’, where the possessive suffix signals the compounding with tamu. In the inscriptions, even pronouns can serve as direct objects without accusative suffix, e.g. bó bitid ökt ‘when I wrote this’. In DreiPrinz 28-30, an early, Manichaean text, we find one direct object without, one with accusative suffix in two adjacent, structurally identical sentences: ikint[i] kâliglika tayak berg[ây] mân; üçünë kâligli[kka] sapxay(i)g bergây mân ‘To the one coming second I will give the staff; to the one coming third I will give the sandals.’ By the context we know that the staff is not less definite and specific than the sandals; the position of tayak just before the verb does not have anything to do with (in)definiteness or (un)specificity either. Zieme 1969: 105 states that the direct object not marked as accusative is more closely linked to the verb, giving these examples: nêcä anîg kîlînë kîlt(i)m(i)z ârsär ‘whatever evil deeds we should have carried out’ (Xw 125; I would read any(i)g instead of anîg) vs. üç üdki nomug bîlt(i)m(i)z ‘We knew the doctrine of the three periods’ (Xw 132). The material does not prove this to be a general rule.

Verbs can govern two direct objects, the first in the accusative and the second in the nominative, as in kîrkiž xaganîg balbal tikdim (KT) Translating the nominative form with ‘as’, we get ‘I set up the Kirkiz ruler as anthropomorphic stele’; translating more loosely one could say ‘I set up a balbal for the K. ruler’. On the other hand balbal tik- could also, in Orkhon Turkic, have become a lexicalised phrase. Another inscriptive example could be bâlgüsîn bitigen bo urning bo yaratdî (Tes 20) ‘This is what he incised and created as his mark and his testament’; here, the forms bâlgüsîn and bitigen could also be instrumentals. This instance again shows, in any case, that Old Turkic pronouns representing direct objects need not be in the accusative. The causative of the inscriptive phrase xagan olor- ‘to rule as xagan’ is xagan olort-

564 Clark (edition of Pothi) writes yolî[n], although Bang & Gabain indicate no lacuna, stating that the “context requires D[irect] O[bject]”, EDPT 434a tacitly yolîn.
Another type of double object is found in arimadok tsuy irinculurimin bošug kolup ... (TT IV B50) ‘asking for forgiveness for my unpurified sins’ and altï azigïn ...kayikikâ buši berû (HTs III 259-60) ‘(The white elephant) gave his six molars to the hunter as alms’. Here as well the first object is in the accusative while the second is in the stem form; both are in the stem form in [b]izîgâ isig öz buši bergil (U IV C91) ‘Bestow life upon us!’ In these cases one should consider a closer juncture for bošug kol- and bušï ber- which might, as lexicalised verb phrases, have taken ‘the sins’ and ‘the six molars’ respectively as objects of the whole phrases. This approach is clearly appropriate for burxan kutïn kög dét- ‘to set one’s heart on the Buddha’ in BT I 1184, where the whole phrase kög dét- in fact governs the dative. The status of tuš ‘encounter’ in kenîn tözûn mayûrî burxanît tuš bolalîm (Pfähl I 10) ‘Ultimately we wish to meet the noble Buddha Maitreya’ is quite different: tuš is not the object of bol- ‘to be’, of course, nor is it its subject: Rather, the accusative is the object of the complex verb tuš bol-, whose subject is the 1st person plural.

Predicative adjectives accompanying verbs of thought and sensation as objects also have the base form, e.g. yakûn ‘near’ with sakûn- and busušlug ‘sad’ with kör- in the following sentences: îrapped yolug yakûn sakûntî ‘He felt the long road to be short’ (HTs VIII 9); Maxarit eläg ädîgî oglî teginig bušûlug körüp înêa tep yarlıkady: amrak oglum, nă üçûn bušušlug kältîq? ‘Seeing (that) the well-thinking prince (was) sad, the king M. said as follows: ’My dear son, why have you come in sadness?’ (KP 4,5). The adjective arîg in çaxsapatîg bökkînî künkâtây arîg kütädîm (DPAMPb 1282) ‘I have observed the precept perfectly until this day’ also belongs to this category.

In bir tûmân ağı altun kümûs kûrgûksîz kûlûrti (KT N 12) ‘He (i.e. the Chinese emissary) brought exactly 10 000 (units of) brocade, gold and silver’ kûrgûksîz, a predicative adjective in the nominative case, (literally ‘without any missing’) is translated as ‘exactly’; its use is adverbal.

tûrk xagan otûkân yîš olorsar (KT S3) ‘If the Turk ruler stays in the Ötükân mountain forest, ...’ has nominative yîš in local function; elsewhere olor- governs the locative. The space one moves through can
also be referred to by a nominal in the nominative, e.g. in yol yorídaći yahňuklar (MaitH XX 13r16) ‘people travelling on roads’.

The nominative is used for expressing time in three ways: Firstly it can express duration: tün kün (U III 75,3 or 80,15) is ‘throughout day and night’ and isig özin ... üć ay köni ... tuta yarlıkadokta signifies ‘when he graciously kept him alive through three months’. Noun phrases in the nominative with yaš or yïl appearing as object of the verb yaša- are used for stating that certain persons ‘lived for so and so many years’. Secondly, runiform inscriptions show nominative temporal expressions in narrative, where the time elapsing during the event is not made salient: tün terilmiş is ‘They are reported to have reorganised at night’ (Š U E1); taq üntürü tɑgdimiz (Tuñ 35) ‘We had (the soldiers) get up at dawn and attacked’. Thirdly, deictic noun phrases in the nominative can also express a point in time, e.g.: bokänki kün sizlär toynlar-a ... šravast kāntkā pinvantka kirinya (U III 34,5) ‘Today you, o monks, can enter the town of Śravasti for alms’. The dative expresses the point in time at which an action takes places if the reference is absolute and not deictic: yeti yegirmikā učti signifies ‘he died on the 27th’ while yeti yegirmi kün učti would presumably have meant ‘he flew for 27 days’. There also is a temporal locative and a temporal instrumental.

In talayıka kicig tăgmādim (KT S3) ‘I did not reach the sea by a little (distance)’ (i.e. ‘I nearly reached the sea’) the adjective kicig stands for what may otherwise be expressed by the instrumental.

4.1102. The genitive

The genitive is usually adnominal and thus attributive, as discussed in section 4.121; one pronominal example is män işe bûn (U IV A26) ‘the people in my town’, where män ‘I’ qualifies bûn ‘town’. In section 4.611 we describe relative constructions whose subject is in the genitive. Genitive forms can also be used predicatively, as sizi sızı in the following example: mänı Ş kazgančım sızıämäz mû? (KP 16,4) ‘Doesn’t my gain belong to you? (said by a father to his son)’; also in bo nişan män Miş Tämûrnînî ol ‘This mark is mine – Miş Tämûr’s’ (USp 1,10). In sızı sızı (M III 24,10) ‘I am yours’ the

565 The UW (284b-285a) makes the absolute temporal use of ay ‘month’ into a special lexicon entry (ay II). This is not, however, a different lexeme from ay ‘moon, month’. Nor can an oblique use of the nominative be considered a case of ellipsis of a case ending (instrumental, dative or locative) or a postposition, as the author writes. Such uses are clearly a syntactic matter – the temporal use of the nominative of terms denoting stretches of time – and not a lexical one.
CHAPTER FOUR

genitive is also predicative although preceding the (presumably clitic) topic. As a headless attributive NP, a genitive form can get governed by a postposition, e.g.: agîr ayîg kîlînîlarîm olarmîn tâg arîzun âlkînzun
(Suv 139,13) ‘May my grave sins get purified away and disappear like theirs (i.e. the bodhisattvas').

4.1103. The accusative
The accusative marks direct objects as in śîmnû+g utup ‘defeating Mâra’. Numerous Orkhon Turkic examples are mentioned in T. Tekin 1968: 127-129; at least at first sight, none appear to be non-specific.
Section 4.1101 mentions numerous examples of direct objects appearing without the accusative suffix even when they are specific and definite. We are at present unable to state any rule in this matter; at least it seems that – in Orkhon Turkic – the accusative suffix does not appear when the object is non-specific. That may have been different in Uycur alîî kîzîlarîg bulun alîp ‘taking six girls as prisoners' (Mait H Y 204) is what the senseless king Virûdhaka does when conquering the city of Kapilavastu in Buddhist mythology. The girls were obviously not mentioned earlier in the story and should not have the accusative suffix if that were a mark of definiteness. Since, however, these girls were so beautiful that they resembled divine girls, they may possibly have been specific.

There is a construction of double accusatives (inscriptions and Uycur) when an indirect object in the semantic role of ‘sufferer’ is topicalised, as in anta òôrî türîgâs karlukug tavarîn alîp âvin yulup barmîs (ŠU S5) ‘Thereupon, the Türgäš robbed the Karluk of their livestock, pillaged their horses and left’. The Karluk are here the ones affected by the fact that their possessions are taken from them. The construction is also used with living beings and their body parts: adgîrîg udlukîn sîyu urtî (KT E36) ‘He hit the stallion, breaking his thigh bone’. In the following example one of the objects is in the stem form: munî iki köz âglîrîp seançayîn (KP 57,5) ‘Let me smite this guy, blinding both his eyes’. Both the person and his eyes are to be pierced, both the person and his eyes to be blinded.

In section 4.622 we discuss object clauses where, in different constructions, their topic or their predicate are put into the accusative case.

4.1104. The dative
The concrete dative of direction is found e.g. in tâgîrîr ... tuôţî ordoka yîgîlûrîr ‘the gods assemble at the Tuşîta palace’ or adnagûka tutuzur
‘he gives (it) to others’ (M III nr.8V v5); it expresses direction also with speech, e.g. in tügüri kuvarağına nom nomlayu ‘preaching to the assembly of gods’. The difference between this use and that of the directive is that the dative is used when the goal is reached (or is meant to be reached), whereas the directive mostly expresses mere movement in the direction of something.

There are temporal datives in the passage koñ yilka yorîdim ... tokuz otuzka süøjüşdüm ‘I set out in the year of the sheep ... and fought on the 29th (inscription of the Uygur steppe empire); the same tokuz otuzka ‘on the 29th’ is attested also in M III nr.2 r8. yazienza (BQ E31) signifies ‘in that spring’, the possessive suffix referring to the winter mentioned in the previous sentence (or to the same year as that winter). Sometimes inscriptive temporal datives refer to stretches of time as frameworks for events, as in the sentence bir yilka tört yol süøjüşdüm (BQ E30) ‘I fought four times within one year’. The suffix sequence -mAk+IPA discussed in section 4.633 forms temporal expressions; in Orkhon Turkic, nominal predicates can also be put into the dative to specify the time a certain event takes place. The common expressions künijâ, ayîja and yilîja mean ‘day by day’, ‘month by month’ and ‘year by year’ (e.g. in KP 7.4-5 and 13.6). Concrete dates such as üçünê ay iki otuzka ‘on the 22nd of the 3rd month’ or takıgu yıl ikinti ay on yanîka566 ‘on the 10th of the 2nd month in the year of the hen’ are always in the dative. Early Manichaean texts also have temporal datives: ol ok künkî ‘on that very day’ (DreiPrinz 108), ol aylarka ‘during those months’ (Windg 19). In Tuñ 27 we find kirkizig uka basdimiz ‘We fell upon the K. while they were asleep’; interestingly enough, the same event is in KT E35 referred to with the sentence Kîrkiz bodunug uda basdimiz. See section 4.1106 for the locative in temporal function.

There appears be a static local dative in the following sentence: “iki agulug yol başîna, tama kapiçîna azgurûgli yolka kim?” tesär (Xw 116-7) ‘If one asks ‘Who is at the beginning of the two poisonous ways, who is on the way which misleads to the gate of hell?’”. Also e.g. ol kam köprüje inca sakînî ‘That magician thought as follows in his heart’ (M I 34,18); thus, with köprüje ... sakînî also in M I 6,17. I know of no such instances in non-Manichaean Uygur.

In nay yerdeki xaganlıg bodunka bintâgi bar ârsâr ná buji bar ârtaçî ârmišt (Tuñ 56) ‘If any independent nation anywhere were to have one like me, what trouble could it ever have?’ bodun, which appears in the dative, refers to a possessor; similarly muhtar ná ârsâr yazok yok

---

566 This term, literally ‘the new (moon)’, is used when referring to a day in the first third of a month.
(PañcÖlm 23) ‘He does not have any sins whatsoever’. Semitic languages or Latin also have datives of possession; Turkish uses the genitive instead. The dative is basically possessive also in ögrünçükä mâñıkä bolmakä bolzun (BT V 149-150) ‘May he attain joy and happiness!’ Below we mention a few instances where the dative with bol- ‘to become’ has a different meaning.

The dative can also be abstract, when it marks the aim of an abstract action: burxan kutïga köñül öritü (BT I 1184) ‘setting one’s heart on his majesty the Buddha’. The DLT proverb sögüt söliñä, kadîn kastïya ‘The willow for its sap, the birch or its bark’ has the same sort of content without a verb. It is in this sense that the compound suffix -gU+kA forms final clauses (section 4.636).

Reference to the action one is directed towards can be generalised by being expressed by bol- ‘to become’: yïlkïka barïmkä bolup (Xw 152, 177-178) ‘being busy with tending livestock’; alğinçü üdäkä boltumuz (M III nr.12 v3) ‘We have had the moment of death on our minds’. Thus also DLT fol. 355 közi yolka bolur ‘his mind gets directed towards leaving’.

An instance like ãzrua täñrikä yazïntimiz (Xw 22-23) ‘We sinned against the god Zerwan’ is again different, as Zerwan is not the beneficiary of the action but the one displeased by it.

In a sentence quoted in Wilkens 2000 nr.65 the dative marks the topic of speech: ãtkä kanka “içmäg yemäñlär” tepän kimïn ayïrdï ‘Concerning meat and blood he said ´Don’t eat or drink it’ and mentioned its punishment’.

In the following examples entities meant to benefit from the action are marked by the dative: kün täŋri bo yer suvä suğar, kântïn yarokïn kamagka yarotïr (M III nr.7, 14,10) ‘The sun rises above this world and lets its light shine for the benefit of all’; är’özïn ämgätip el işiñä (M III nr.23 r8-9) ‘straining his body for the sake of the state’. In yegädmäk utoym bolzun mapä (M I 28,18-19) ‘May I ... attain victory’ the beneficiary is also in the dative.

The objects of emotions can be marked by the dative, e.g. mapa amranmakâjîz ‘your love for me’ in U III 29,1 or sağa amranmakän ... ölür män (U III 82,28) ‘I die from love for you’. The dative in m(ä)şïxa burxan ... buşi berigli ... kïsïlïrig kântïnïñ äçgï ögïsïñä äçgï ögïli tep atadï (M III Nr.6 I r5) presumably also expresses positive emotion:

---

567 If interpreted correctly; the ms. has been read as tängräñ. 
The prophet Christ called ... almsgiving ... persons ‘compassionate to those who were compassionate towards him’.

Causes and sources of processes and events are equally expressed by the dative: täŋrlär täŋri katunläri täŋri münişiä üüsüüp ‘the gods and goddesses were intoxicated by divine bliss’; tavgäc xamniñ öüüçiä ... aliŋ büütüriš (BT II 105) ‘complying with the request of the Chinese ruler ... he took it and finished it’. ol ogurka in UI 23,17 is ‘because of that event’. What we find in näkä įglayu busušlug käldiŋ (KP 5,2) is also causal, whether we translate it as ‘At what’ or ‘Why did you come crying and sad?’ kork- ‘to be afraid of something’ governs the source of fear in the dative, e.g. in U III 75,6; this source could, of course, also be classified as an object of an emotion.

In economical documents the price of a transaction is often mentioned in the dative case.

In okiŋcäka oktïp ‘having (somebody) called by the herald’ the dative marks the intermediate agent which accompanies the causative derivate of a transitive verb. The dative in sogdaŋ tavgäča ... bay bafik yapïï bertim (ŠU) is therefore to be translated either as ‘he had B. B. constructed for Sogdians’ or ‘by Sogdians’. Cf. further bo burxanlarïa kütarguluk, bo arxantlarïa kütarguluk, bo şarïkä sütüülüp kütarguluk ol (Maith Y 118) ‘This one is to be saved by buddhas, this one by arhats (and) this one by having faith in relics’. The agentive dative is not limited to causatives, however, as shown e.g. in kalmadï ärïk ayïg kïlïn ‘... has become quite well-known to you’ or ‘no aspects of it have remained hidden to you’.

The sentence otrö maxendrasene elig öç tëri[ğ] ätöziää kaparmïš äitin yara biçïp ak[a] kalmïš söl sūvïn iglig ärkä içïïp ... (U III 45,13) can be translated in several ways: Either as ‘Thereupon, king Mahendrasena split and cut the swollen flesh of his own live body, had the sick man drink the lymph water which had come flowing ...’ or ‘... let the sick man drink the lymph water ...’ or ‘... had the lymph water drunk by the sick man ...’. In other words, the sick man is both the beneficiary and the intermediate agent of the action in which he is either an active or a passive participant. The functions of datives with causative verb forms are further discussed in section 4.5.

---

568 This follows the interpretation of UW 257a top; the editor proposed a causal interpretation (see below), which left käntüüï unexplained.
4.1105. The directive

The directive is very much alive in Orkhon Turkic. It is there used to express motion towards or to places, e.g. in bän ävgärü tuašäyin ‘let me (go) home and dismount’ (Tuñ I N6) or ötükän yišgaru uduştun (Tuñ I S8) ‘I led (them) to(wards) the Ötükän mountain forest’. In the direction of peoples: oguzgaru sü taškdümüñ ‘we started a campaign against the Oguaz’ (KT N 8); individuals: apa taŋkargaru ičrāı sav idiñiš (Tuñ I N10) ‘we heard he sent a secret message to A.T.’ or, with a pronoun, xagan baŋgaru anča ayı idiñiš (Tuñ I N10) ‘the message sent to me by the king was as follows.’. The object to be reached can also be abstract: bunci esığ kučığ bertɵkgärü sakimmañ (KT E 10) ‘without giving thoughts to the fact that they have given so much service’; ölläči bodunug tir(i)g(g)ärü igi(d)tim (KT E 29) ‘I have reared the dying people (back) to life’.

In Manichaean sources the directive is also relatively common, and most of the nouns used in this case form again refer to places: e.g. m]anistangaru ter(i)lti[iʃ]ūr ‘you have flocked to the sanctuary’ (M III nr.27 v5). There are also individuals, e.g. tāŋrigärü ‘to god’ in Xw 160 and 165, siziŋ kutunjargaru ‘to your honour’ in M III nr.9 II r8, mani burxangaru ‘to Mani the prophet’ in Wettkampf 11, älțiŋjärü in M III nr.8 V v2 ‘to his hand’ etc.; siziŋjärü is especially common. No action nouns are known to me to appear in this case form in Uygur, however, as we found in Orkhon Turkic. In some instances, e.g. in the İrQB, the subject clearly does reach his goal, as with the dative. 569

The directive is rather rare in non-Manichaean Uygur. We find it e.g. in yakın kälip bäggärü ötünti ol buryukï (Suv 637,23) ‘He came close and spoke to the lord, that minister.’ ötüin- can also govern the dative, but perhaps bäggürü is actually governed by yakın käl-; this is, at any rate, the only example of a non-petrified directive form in the Suv. In the sentence v(i)r(x)arka yakın yergärü olorup v(i)r(x)ar ičməj kovuk sovik arigiz kämiştimiz (Mait Taf 174r28), the form does not appear to have been used in directive meaning, as one does not sit (down) towards a place. Petrified directives such as ičgärü ‘in’, tašgaru ‘out’, ilgärü ‘forward’ or ‘towards the east’ oŋgaru ‘to the right’, yokaru ‘up’, birgärü ‘to one place’ and perhaps a few others appear in all sorts of Uygur texts, Manichaean and other. In barçada ičgärırök (BT V 170) ‘more internal than everything (else)’ we see that ičgärü need not have

569 The difference between concrete dative and directive needs more elucidation. In Tuvan, e.g., the directive is used if an object moves away from the observer, the dative if it moves towards the observer; some such principle might be at play in Old Turkic as well.
had strictly directive meaning even in a Manichaean source. Cf. also ilgärüsi kerüsi ‘its east and west’, used without directive meaning in HTs III 577.

The directive no longer exists in Qarakhanid; the verse anda bolup täyriğür üňığin ötär ‘Being there he gives his service to God’ in DLT fol.555 must therefore be particularly archaic.

4.1106. The locative
The locative refers to placement, e.g. in Kögmän tagda ‘on the Sayan mountain’ (Orkhon Turkic); ol ävädä ‘in that house’ (U II 35,18). It can also refer to states: Kirik bołunug uda başdimiz (KT E 35) ‘We fell upon the K. people while they were asleep’ (on l.37 with the Türgäš as object). In adgii kü at tört bulunuda yađälti (KP 7.2) ‘The good reputation spread everywhere’ (literally ‘in four corners’) the locative form refers to the domain of the action.

Implements serving as containers are also found in the locative case: suvlukta täyriğün suv külärüp ‘bringing water in a ... water vessel’ (U III 38,26).

The temporal use of the locative is apparently not too common. The London (Manichaean script) ms. of the Xw on its l.338 adds bir yegirmineč ay beş oμuzda ‘on the 25th of the 11th month’ as dating to the text; its copyist appears to have spoken a dialect which differed in this matter from his source. Further examples are bokünkä küntä ‘today’ (U III 50,8 as against bokünkä kiin in 34,5), ün keņņḫä ‘at the end’ (U III 31,2) or siziŋ yaŋıŋıŋıŋ ciŋ bir aşunu arığ kozudgali tapayu täğıntim ‘I have endeavoured to accept your commands so as to observe them throughout one life’ (U III 36,1). The dative and the nominative are also used for expressing time.

The locative is used also with verbs of motion to mark the goal if the result of the event is a state. In Manichaean texts: ol așanmĂš aš kim ol ât očintä kirür olur (M III nr.6 II r3) ‘That eaten food which enters that body dies’; ol yalpraŋkapä yerdä tüśdi (ManUigFr r7) ‘The demon hid in a tree, but the leaves of that tree fell to the ground’ or oči täyirif yeri ičĕndä kirti (1.8 of ms. M 541 edited in the note to BT V 217) ‘He himself entered into the divine country.’ In Buddhist texts: dyan sakinečg y(i)ti kiltĕ köngüllg eligstä kirsår tumlars (UigBlock 30-31) ‘if the sword – i.e. meditation – enters the hand – i.e. the heart – and stays there, …’; ikkiläyi tamuda tišmäti (BT II 374-377) ‘not falling into hell once again …’; bašımataq etiğlg tokirım yuplaŋ yerdä tüśär bolur (MaitH XIII 4r6) ‘I dreamt that the adorned bun on my head disintegrates and falls to the ground’; ikũti ažunät bärgäli sakûnyok sân
(U III 48,6) ‘you’ve decided to go to another existence’; not, of course, coming back.\(^{570}\)

In *ol yüknï üstïn tęñri altïn yaljuuka kim ârsâr kâçên tüdtaê yok* (TT X 104-106) ‘There is nobody, neither among gods above nor among humans below, who restrains the power of that demon’ the locative indicates membership in a group; it is here translated as ‘among’. Similarly *biz ikigüdä kanyusi kücüÎgrïk biz* (Wettkampf 43) ‘Who among us two is the stronger?’. In relatively early texts, including the runiform ones, the locative has ablative meaning in addition to the locatival one, as in inscriptional *Tabgaç xaganta bâûzêi kâliôtûm* ‘I brought decorators from the Chinese emperor’. Cf. further *ay tüñri ordoïnta enipân* ‘coming down from the palace of the Moon God’ (l.8 of the Manichæan hymn edited in *UAJb* 16:221-2) and *mintiôd ... tutgil* ‘receive ... from me’ (Mait 187r11-12). In Mait 5r16-17 (missing part completed from out of the parallel Hami ms.) the ms. had the clause *tagda çëmagantik atlik *ot kâliôrÎüp* ‘bringing the herb named çëmagandhika from the mountain’, but *barip* ‘going’ was subsequently added above the word *tagda*, in order (according to Laut 1986: 62) to get the now unusual ablative use of the locative understood by the reader. The phrase *ölümtä / ölmäkdä oz-* ‘to escape death’ appears a number of times in IrqB and in l.2 of the hymn mentioned above, and cf. *ämäkliôntä ozg[ur]-* (Mait 135r16-17), *ämäktä ozgur* - (KP 6,2). In *șiç tidîmlïg xanlarnï sıç yûltïçda sıç* (Wettkampf 49) ‘You are from the root of crowned kings’ an ablative locative is used predicatively.

Comparatives always govern the +dA form, as in *antada takî yegräk* ‘even better than that’ or *barçada ûçurïrak barçada ûçarïk* (BT V 170-171) ‘more central and higher than everything (else)’. They need not have +rAk, as in *kamagaç öyrä ‘first of all’, muntada ymä munçadÎçig ‘more wondrous than this’ (Mait 26A r3) or *sinïîtä üstïn sûgülûk taplaguluk âd tavar bulmaz män* (U III 83,3) ‘I can’t find anything more highly lovable and desirable than you’.

Elatives can repeat the same adjective, putting it first into the locative case form, as *aglakta aglak* (MaitH XI 6r10-11) ‘most unfrequented’, *türiyçå türiyç* (Suv) ‘exceedingly deep’, *artokta artok* (U IV B2) ‘very much’.

Relational nouns (discussed in section 4.22) practically always appear in the locative. This holds not only for local and temporal ones such as

---

\(^{570}\) Another DKPAM instance of *bar- + locative* appears in *SIAL* 18(2003): 155 (1,7); the editor in a note expresses his opinion that this is rare and quotes three further instances from Suv.
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*in*, öngüzde ‘before you’, üskümde ‘in my presence’, kenindé ‘after’ but also for the ones with abstract meaning such as yolında ‘concerning’, ugrinta ‘for the sake of’, tillaginta ‘because of’, kaçinta ‘due to’ or tüšinta ‘as a result of’. I take it that the non-local ones, such as tilăg ‘reason’, kăc ‘force’ or tüš ‘fruit’, do this in analogy to the ones having local or temporal semantics in the first place, such as yol ‘way’ or ur ‘point in time, occasion’.

4.1107. The directive-locative / partitive-locative
With +rA we have to distinguish between living uses with partitive locative meaning and petrified forms, which we have called directive-locative. Among these latter tašra, ičrā and asra571 are local, while oğra ‘before’ and kesrä ‘after’ are temporal; the later BT III 891 adds tüp soğra ‘at the very end’ < soğ+rA, which is also temporal. We find the directive-locative in a number of functions: The forms are, first of all, used adnominally, both by themselves as ičrā sav in Tuğ 34 ‘internal (perhaps ‘secret’) letter’, asra mansız sakınčlar ‘humble unassuming thoughts’ (TT II,2 68) or oğra azunda ki kılınc (TT VIII F 15) ‘an action in a previous incarnation’, and with +kl, as ičrāki (also lexicalised as a title) and oğrāki (oğrāki eliğlär ‘the ancient kings’ in TT I 93); we even have ün oğrā ‘earliest’. The inscriptions used the +rA forms in pairs, to represent opposite topics: ičrā ašız, tašra tonsuz (KT E26, BQ E21) ‘no food in their stomachs and no clothes on their backs’, beriyā tavgacg, oğrā kitaňg (Tuğ 7) ‘in the south the Chinese, in the east the Kitans’ or üçâ kök tügrî asra yagïz yer kilïntokda (KT E1) ‘when the blue heaven was created above and the brown earth below’; in BQ S13 kesrä and oğra are opposed in a similar way. In adverbial use we find them in ičrā bán bulgâyin (ŞU S4) ‘I will stir up internal dissent’ oğrā kün tugsîkda (KT E4) ‘in the east, where the sun rises’ or tašra yoriýur (KT E 11-12) ‘They are marching out’; documentation for directive-locative forms as postpositions is given in section 4.21: kesrä and tašra are found to govern the locative, asra the nominative, oğrā and ičrā either the locative or the nominative.

In living use we find +rA added to names of body parts of persons or other creatures, which are also referred to as such in the sentence: süjîn yurârâ sançit- (Mait Taf 33r8) is ‘to be pierced at one’s heart by a lance’, kušlar kargalar kâlip töpôrâ sokup karakümün saçratürkar (Mait Taf 203r5 = MaitH XX 13r4) ‘birds and ravens come, pick at our

571 The Uygur use of asra and asrakî is documented in the UW; see the EDPT for their cognate as+tôn, which was in use from Qarakhanid on (both in DLT and QB).
heads and gouge out our eyeballs’. *bāšra tāpip* (U III 14.3) appears in fragmentary context but the DLT has four instances of *bāšra* ‘on the head’ all connected with the meaning of ‘striking’ or ‘hitting’.

The ‘body part – body’ relationship prompted the term ‘partitive-locative’; if the reference to living beings is by noun phrase or pronoun, the nominals referring to that whole are placed in the accusative: *ūc adrī sāǧūn olarnī ogsuz tāginēsiz öz konokra sančarlar* (Mait Taf 75r16) ‘they pierce them with tridents at any moment at the seat of their soul (*öz konok*)’. In *bīr ikintiškā közā kułjakra sančišur biz, tīlimiznī bičišur biz* (Mait Taf 174v29) ‘We stab each other in the eye and the ear and cut each other’s tongue’ and in *agulug oğın yūrākrā urup amrak isig özün üçgil* (U III 55,4) ‘end its (i.e. the elephant’s) dear life, hitting (it) at (its) heart with a poisoned arrow’, we find that the body parts *köz, kułak* and *yūrāk* are put into the partitive-locative case while *tīl* and *isig öz* are in the accusative with possessive suffix. For the first group there is explicit or implicit reference to the owners of the body parts, the speaker in the first sentence, the elephant in the second; this reference is taken up by possessive suffixes in the second part of the sentences, but that is linked with a switch to the accusative. In *orgaklar kāli̇p bízni tüprā orarlar* ‘Sickles come and mow us off our roots’ (Mait 201v9) the speakers and victims are plants and not living beings; it is not clear whether plants are in principle included in the domain of +rA or whether the use of this suffix here indicates that the plants are being metaphorically assimilated to (suffering) living beings. Note that this partitive-locative use is compatible with the victim (e.g. *bīzni*) or a part of his body + possessive suffix (e.g. *tīlimiznī*) being put into the accusative, but that the +rA noun itself is incapable of such reference by possessive suffix. In *tāŋri burxan yarlıgın töpörâ tuta tāginšp kāntū kāntū ārgišnjarū yadılı̇tlar* (TT VI 464) ‘They respectfully brought the divine Buddha’s decree to their heads and dispersed each to his own abode’ the action is a gentle one, unlike the other instances quoted. This is also an example for all the ways in which +rA and +gArU (which some had thought to be related or even identical) differ: the former referring to a body part without possessive suffix, the latter referring to a place and coming with a possessive suffix which refers to the subject of the two verb phrases.

4.1108. The ablative

The ablative expresses ‘source’, as in *ögdin kaŋdın bālgürmiŋ ʿaʾrʾöz* ‘the body which emerged from mother and father’ (as distinct from the spiritual body; Mait 26A r12), or *tāŋri yerintin tayarlar* ‘they slip down
from the divine land'. In Manichaean texts we have, e.g., *xormuzta tāpiryg kamūdan yokaru agurtā* (M I 13,19) ‘They raised the god Ohrmizd up from hell’; *īg yaŋī yerđan temin őrtāırēčā* (M I 14,11) ‘as one straightway grows a plant from fresh earth’; *tōpōdān tīrāŋak učēŋa ītāgī* (M I 17,19) ‘from head to the tip of the (toe-) nail’ etc.; many more examples are mentioned in Zieme 1969: 115. Ablatival content is, in all runiform and most Manichaean sources, mostly expressed by the suffix +dAn, and some Manichaean texts have both +dAn and ablative +dA. The examples *ot kim īgačdan ūnūp yana īgačag őrtāyūr* ‘the fire which arises from a tree and then burns the tree’ (M I 7,3) and *tonnum bīti kim kišānāg tārīsīn tā ūnūp yana kišānāg kanīn kāntū sorar* ‘the clothes’ louse which arises from a person’s skin and then itself sucks the person’s blood’ (M I 8,15) occur in the same passage of one and the same text and are intended to serve as similes for the same phenomenon; yet one has īgač+dAn while the other uses the form tārisin+tā. But then fire and lice do not behave in the same manner; in English one would also say that lice arose in somebody’s skin (as believed in the Middle Ages). A flame has an upward movement by nature and continuously, which is not the case with lice (presumably not while being born, at any rate). From looking at the examples of +dAn (which is the form most Manichaean texts have) and of ablative +dA one gets the impression that their uses are not identical: The former is generally used of physical movement away from a source, while the latter refers to sources from which the subject merely separates or keeps apart, serves in comparison, is governed by postpositions like *ken* ‘after’.

*oz- and kutrul-*, both ‘to be saved, escape’, as well as their causative counterparts govern the ablative or the ablative locative; e.g. *alp adalarīntūn őszunlar* (thus the ms. in Pothi 233) ‘May they escape their grave dangers’, *bo adatrīn kutrulgay sān* (DKPAMPb 228) and *ramutīn tūzīnī ozkurtnūg* (Pothi 68) ‘You have saved them all from hell’, *ulmētig a[žun]larīntūn kutgarīp* (Pothi 119) vs. *ölümlü ozmiš* (IqB XLIX) ‘She escaped death’ and *āmgāktū ozgurgay sān* (KP 6,2) ‘You will free them from suffering’.

In section 4.635 we mention a number of examples in rather late texts of the ablative added to the infinitive or to verbal nouns such as the one in -dōk to express cause.

The DLT proverb *kič ildoš küršā tōrō tūŋlūkīnt ēkār* shows ablatives in prolative meaning; it signifies ‘If violence comes in by the (tent’s)
entrance, proper conduct goes out by the smoke hole’. Orkhon Turkic and Uygur use $+cA$ as prolative case. The ablative formed with $+dIn \sim +dAn$ is not easy to distinguish from the orientational formative $+dXn$ (which, in fact, often appears as $+dIn$ in Buddhist texts): The latter never has ablative meaning, is added to bases whose actual interpretation is deictic and can be used adnominally; the former never qualifies nouns.

4.1109. The equative

Examples for the original spatial meanings of the equative are rather rare. One of these meanings is limitative (‘up to a certain point’), e.g. belçä bögüzça suvda ýorići (KP 36,4) ‘to walk in water reaching up to one’s waist or throat’ or tizçä ‘knee-deep’ (MaitH XXV 3v19). Another spatial meaning is prolative (‘by a certain road’); e.g. frištï uþucup adïn őði yolkça ýoriði ol mögoèçlar iç (U I 9, Magier) ‘the angel led the Magi by a different way’; kök† kalik yolïnçä (DKPAMPb 215) ‘through the sky’ or őñïïñ agïzçä kירïp ‘entering by the mother’s mouth’ (BT VII A 262-3). It is this meaning which also gave kança ‘where to’ and the like. I take the prolative meaning of $+cA$ to have been the primary one, as the passages from that to accordance or similarity seem to be likely semantic paths. In the previous section we mentioned a Qarakhanid instance of the ablative used as prolative case.

Quantitative approximation is a content often expressed by $+cA$, as in gaŋ őğüzðäki kum sanïnçä ‘as many as the sand particles in the river Ganges’ (U II 47,83) or, adnominally, őlíçä är (Tuñ 42) ‘approximately fifty men’. köğülçä is ‘as much as one’s heart desires’. barçä ‘all’ is presumably also constructed from bar ‘(what) there is’ by using $+cA$ in such a quantitative place, originally presumably meaning ‘as much as there is’. tükä-gü+cä in näčä yapkasar üïkägïçä jïvar algïl (U

---

572 il is the base of ilgäri ‘forward, eastward’ and ilkï ‘first’ because the entrance of the early Turks’ tents were made to face the rising sun.

573 Examples for orientational $+dXn$ are ikidìn âvãgüştä ‘from his ribs on both sides’ (DKPAMPb 207) and orton (< *ortodun) yol ‘the middle way’. ol ýükñïn ýitïn ýäpri altïn ýalïnka kmü ârsïr kaçïn üïdaqi yok (TT X 104-106) signifies ‘There is nobody, neither among the gods above nor the humans below, who restrains the power of that demon’. (BT I D 186). $+dXn$ forms can also be used as postpositions governing the locative or the nominative; cf. section 4.21. In kištï alasï ičïn, ýïlki alasï taštïn (DLT fol. 58) ič+tïn and tašt+tïn are used predicatively; this proverb can perhaps be best translated as ‘An animal’s leprosy is visible; a person’s leprosy (metaphorical for treachery) is hidden’. $+dXn$ forms can get possessive suffixes referring to the orientational centre: taglïn+in+tï (e.g. in HTs III 275) signifies ‘to its north’. Forms like this last one show that $+dXn$ is not a case suffix, as its place is before, not after the possessive suffix.
III 47,19) and ärđî yenčü kāmikā tākāgūčā uruṇ (KP 34,3) has a
similar meaning: ‘Take as much stuff as you like, till there is none left’
and ‘loading as much jewels and pearls on the ship as there were’. More
documentation for -gU+čA and -mlš+čA expressing limitative
quantification is quoted at the end of section 4.124. Many instances of
the very common bunča (munča) and anča also refer to quantification,
as anča amğānīp (KP 47,3) ‘going to so much trouble’.
Just as often, however, +čA expresses abstract accordance, e.g.
bođunug ḍčum apam tōrōsinča yarāmtiš (KT E 13, BQ E 12) ‘he
organized the nation according to the tradition of my ancestors’; kiyinig
kōñlūyācā av (Tuñ I N8) ‘pass judgement as you see fit’, lit. ‘according
to your heart’; yaljąkklar saninča bōgsār ‘if one sums (it) up by human
reckoning (as against divine years which, in Buddhist mythology, are
considerably longer)’ or toğužunč ku tōrōsinča altunųk kūrekarnųŋ
ārdnilig torāntu olore ḳ uruṇ ‘sitting among the jewel nets of the golden
tent in the manner of the ninth stratum’.
There is an ‘equative’ of judgement with sakīn-: tiši kēśilār(i)iŋ kōrkīn
mānçin nāŋ yōkē ḋālīṣizcē sacīnur (M III nr.8VII r8-9) ‘He thinks of
female persons’ appearance and face as (+čA) nought and worthless’ or
bākṣic mānçūzū bātızg bākčē mānçcē sakūnīpp ... (Mait colophon edited
by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133) ‘(I) considered the fickle
and transient body to be stable and durable’.
Similarity is also expressed by this suffix: ikinti kām ṭörtē kēzjē kāltu (Tuñ II W4-5) ‘the next day he arrived red-hot as fire’;
kanîŋ suvēcā yūgūrti, sāyjūkkl tagča yatdē (KT E24) ‘your blood flowed like water,
your bones lay there like a mountain’. In this last function +čA was in
competition with the similative (and with the postposition tāg): We
have arpača sačīmtiš ‘scattered like barley’ in l.3 of the (early) hymn
edited in UA Jab 16: 221-2 but [kal]vįkiyayu sačīlu ‘getting scattered like
chaff’ in (late) Neujahr 29.
In sūcīg savīn yimṣak aṣin arīp ḍođunug anča yagurtı amriš (KT S5 = BQ N4) ‘They used to cheat them with sweet words and soft
textiles and thereby used to attract the distant tribes to their vicinity’ the
form anča refers to means (detailed in the first part of the sentence)
used for the purpose expressed by the main verb.
+čA is often added to names for peoples to form adjectives, as
ānātkāčē ‘Indian’. The reference to languages by equative forms also
comes from this special use of similative +čA. The target language of
translations can appear with +čA, e.g. kājši ačari ānātkāk [ti]jintin

574 In his note to his edition of the KP passage, Hamilton argues for translating
tūkāgūčā as ‘as much as is necessary’; this is possible.
4.1110. The instrumental

One of the meanings of the instrumental morpheme is instrumental in the narrow sense, as amarî tamuluğlarîg irig ertaşîn ertaşâylâr, kärîn yonarlar, baltun yararlar ‘They saw some of the dwellers of hell with large saws, hew them with axes, split them up with hammers’ (MaitH XV 3v25-26), from ertaş, kärî and baltu respectively. The instrumental is used for expressing a tool or a means to an end already in Orkhon Turkic ok+(un ‘with an arrow’ (KT E 36). In bo yolun yorîsar ‘if we walk this way’ (Tuñ I S8) the way is the ‘means’ for carrying out one’s aim. The subject’s body parts are also instruments, e.g. in tumşukîn tarmakîn tarmo ‘to scratch with their beaks and claws’ or in ol kînê ogulka ... iki kolucaîn atasînîg boyunîn kuçûp ... (DKPAMb 197) ‘that sweet little boy ... embraced his father’s neck with his two little arms ...’.

In the sentence bodisavt yarîkanenî biligenînîcê sakînê sakînur ‘In his commiseration, the bodhisattva has the following thoughts’ we find the instrumental in its most abstract instrumental use. ämgåkîl l kâtîg / ulug înîn uüyî / külüsî l mînûrî - is ‘to moan, to laugh or to bellow with a painful, strong or loud voice’. The voice is here no longer an instrument in the narrow sense, in that the subject does not make conscious and purpose-oriented use of it.

The instrumentals in ag(â)r kadguÎ ulug busuşun yanîp bardi ‘He burned away in great grief and sorrow’ (early Uygur), sâga amranmakîn ... olûr mûn ‘I die from love for you’ (U III 82,28), äsrûkûn ögûsz bolup ‘getting senseless through drunkenness’ (M I 6,16) or tinîlgîrîg ... ârînî ämgåkîn olûrîr (TT X 50) ‘He kills the creatures with great pain’ may all express manner, circumstance or what brought the event about; cf. tiltagîn ‘because’ and nû tiltagîn ‘why’. Here the instrumental does not, of course, express a conscious means either.

Measure is expressed e.g. in tužît tângîrî yerintîkî yîl sanîn sanasar ‘if one counts by the reckoning of years of the Tușita heavens’.
The instrumental expresses manner in *bodun ... yadagín yalin yana kälti* ‘the people came back on foot and practically naked’ (KT E 28). It expresses posture in *töpö+n* ‘head down(wards)’, in phrases such as *töpö n tüš* ‘to fall head downwards; to bow with one’s head on the ground’ or *töpö n yatgur* ‘to make somebody lie down with one’s face to the ground’ both attested several times.

Its appearance is frequent in temporal expressions, as in *kišin* ‘in winter’ (BQ S 2), *ol üdün* ‘at that time’ (Xw 7), *sön* ‘for some time’ (Xw 9), *nä kolon* ‘at what moment’ (M III nr. 7, nr. 15-16); as non-referential temporal in *temin* ‘just now’, *tün+ün kün+ün* ‘by day and night’ or *yılın aynı turkara äv bark ičindä aği tuğ ägsömäz* (TT VI 62) ‘Continuously, through years and months, hazards and calamities at home do not stop’.

It has been said that the instrumental does not have local meaning (Gabain 1950: 10, a.o.). With *amga korugun kišla*- ‘to spend the winter in the goat reserve’ in Orkhon Turkic, however, and in *çı+ım+ın yayladım* ‘I spent the summer within my borders’ (SU) a purely instrumental meaning would I think, be very unlikely. Another spatial use of this case, already mentioned above, is the ‘path’.

The use to which *baš+ın* from *baš* ‘head’ is commonly put does not enter into any of the mentioned categories; e.g. *sanki č(a)kr(a)v(a)rt eliğ xan bašın sükiz tümän tört mï säkiz tümän tört mï bätgär* (MaitH XVI 2a7) ‘the 14000 lords headed by the cakravartin king Şanıkha.’

With *är*, the instrumental suffix describes states, e.g. in *äsänin ādgün är* ‘to be well’ (UigBrief A), *tirigin är* ‘to be alive’ (BT V 220; also 517-8 and 523), *käntü ymä arigín turugun ärür, üzüksüz arigín ärmäkig sävär amrayur* (M III 8 V r 6-7) ‘And he himself keeps pure, and loves being clean all the time’. *kutlugun kivligi ornanur* (TT VI 101) ‘He dwells in blessing’ may be similar, or the ‘blessing’ may be instrumental in the narrower sense.

Schinkewitsch 1926 gives examples for the use of the instrumental in the DLT, stating that it is fully productive in that source.

4.1111. The comitative

This rare case gives the meaning ‘(together) with’. It appears as +*ÜgU* in inscriptional sources, as +*UgUn* in Manichaean ones. Examples for the latter are *tägri ič tägri lárugün ... kźlr* (M III 31,2, nr. 13II r2) ‘The ... god comes with the three gods’, and *tägri lár sölz+in+lágün yâkkâ sümüsgâli kälti* (Xw 2) ‘with the word of the gods he came to fight the demon’. In *aniğ kiliçlıg šti̇nnulugun beş törlük yâklârugün sümüþdi* (Xw 4-5) ‘He fought with the evil-doing devil and with the five
classes of demons’ and *ot tâŋri sön yâklügüün sümüşüp* (Xw 74) ‘the god of fire fought with the demon a long time ago’\(^{575}\) the comitative is also reciprocal in content. In BQ E33 we have *iniligü* ‘together with a younger brother’, in BQ E41 *eki üc kishiğü tâzip barâ* ‘he fled with two or three persons’.

4.1112. The similative
The similative in *+lAyU*, common in Orkhon Turkic, Uygur and Qarakhanid with nouns in all semantic domains and with pronouns, signifies ‘like, similar to, as if’. Its use appears to have been mainly adverbial, in accordance with its origin as a converse form (*+lA-yU*). The common Orkhon Turkic expression *oplau yâg*- ‘to attack like a threshing ox’ already has this case suffix. The form is discussed, with numerous examples, in OTWF 406-9. Cf. further *yultuz+layu tizilmiš ‘arranged in a row like stars’ (HTs III 532), sâkiz yîŋak barêa kizâčîlîyü čokruđi (HTs VII 816) ‘The four corners of the earth are boiling like a pot’ or the adnominal instance *yul+layu bay ‘rich as a fountain*’ (HTs VIII 177). *muniilayu* signifies ‘thus’, whereas *anîlaya ok* (with *ok* in all examples known to me) has a more sentence-adverbial function. The similative was in competition with the postposition *tâg* and with the case suffix *+ČA* when used with similative meaning (rather rare in Old Turkic).

4.12. Complex nominal phrases
Old Turkic complex nominal phrases are practically always syntactical constructions with one nominal phrase as head and another one as satellite. It is quite rare for them to become one word; such an instance is *ät’öz* ‘body’, in Semitic scripts always spelled without space between its parts (*ät* ‘flesh’ and *öz* ‘essence; self’) but with an *alef* before the rounded vowel. Three instances in BuddhKat (Tibetan script) and nine instances in TT VIII and Maue 1996 (Brâhmì) spelled *ätüz* show that it was treated as one word: In non-first syllables of words, *lo o* appear only if the preceding syllable is also /lo/ or /lø/ or if the word ends in a /k/ immediately following upon the vowel in question. (There are, on the other hand, 24 Brâhmì instances where it does show *ö* in the second syllable.) *künt(ā)ŋri* is, e.g., spelled as one word in TT X 288; it denotes the ‘sun’, not necessarily as a deity. *yer suv*, literally ‘land [and] water’ signifies ‘country’; we find the two words spelled as one in TT X.
Proper names formed with the element xan ‘ruler’ are discussed in OTWF 76–7.

There is a variety of complex nominal phrases; we here group them according to whether their satellite is possessive, descriptive, deictic or quantifying. Descriptive satellites specify the meaning of the head. The difference between deictic and possessive ones should become sufficiently clear when considering pronominal satellites: ol is deictic, its genitive anï possessive. Descriptive, deictic and quantifying satellites are not, as such, NPs, and do not establish any reference relationship distinct from that of their head; possessive satellites, on the other hand, do establish a reference relationship of their own, unless they are sortal (generic in a sense, in which case they in fact describe the kernel). Any morphology relating to the syntactic use to which the nominal phrase as a whole is put is borne by the head and not the satellite; such morphology will be disregarded in this section.

4.121. Nominal phrases with possessive satellite

What is commonly termed as ‘possession’ is often expressed with both the possessive suffix on the head and the genitive of the satellite: Pronominal examples are mànîn sûm (ŠU S9) ‘my army’, mànîn yutuzum (M I 5₂) ‘my wife’ or bizîn üzzütümüz ‘our souls’ (Xw 8). In the last instance the phrase is an apposition to ‘the fivefold god who is the son of Hormuzta’; the identity of this god with our soul is indeed something to be stressed.

Nominals can, in addition, be qualified by a demonstrative (as in Italian, unlike English, French or German), e.g. bo bizîn âmğûkimiz ‘this suffering of ours’ (TT X 68) or an adjective. An adjective need not follow the genitive of the personal pronoun but can also precede it, as amrak mànîn oglam ‘my dear son’ (DKPAMPb 1024), k(a)mug mànîn sûrûgûm (BT V 941–2) ‘my whole herd’, yavaš mànîn ogûcûm (BT XIII 12, 111) ‘my dear gentle mother’. altunluq kûrekâmûr ârûnilg tôrûn ‘the jewel net of the golden temple’ and satîqêniq oûdi ârûg ‘the merchant’s advice’ are instances with nominal satellite. When a nominal satellite refers to a person other than the third, the possessive suffix of the head is also of that person, e.g. männ xwentsonuny küçûm (HTsPek 89r5–11) ‘my, Xuanzang’s, powers’ or männ kitay kayanîq ... kitay oglanûm (Mi3,2 in SammlUigKontr 2) ‘my, Kitay-kaya’s ... Chinese servant’.

576 This ms. may have been particularly prone to such spellings or its editor may have been especially sensitive to them.
For an example like *tonnuh bitti* ‘clothes louse’ (M I 8,14) the context makes it clear that clothes and louse are generic: in Old Turkic it does not seem to be the case that genitive satellites are specific while non-adjectival satellites in the nominative are generic (as we know it e.g. from modern Turkish).

Text organisation can get other parts of a sentence intervene between a genitive and its head; thus in the following example (TT X 104-106), where *yäk+niy* ‘the demon’s’ is a satellite of *kič+in* ‘his power (acc.)’:

> In *öl yäkni üstit bäri altın yalıktə kim ərsər kiçin tiştəq yok* ‘There is nobody, neither among the gods above nor among the humans below, who restrains the power of that demon’ the demon is the topic. There is no justification for the view expressed by Gabain in her note to the passage that this is an instance of ‘untürkische Wortfolge’.

In instances as the following the head has the 3rd person possessive suffix but the satellite is unmarked: *kelän käyik muyuzi* (TT I 42) ‘the horn of a unicorn’, *täprü yeri* ‘divine land’, *xan süsi* ‘the royal army’, *kiğmän irintä* ‘north of the Sayan (range)’, *burxanlar tamgası* ‘the seal (i.e. the last) of the Buddhas’, *beś täprü yaroki* ‘the light of the fivefold god’, *nom kuti* ‘the holy doctrine’, *sansar âmgâki* (U II 81,68) ‘the sufferings of *samsâra*’, Orkhon Turkic *köl tegin atisi* (yollug tegin) ‘(Y.T.,) the nephew of K. tegin’. Plural satellites need not be in the genitive either: *täprülär sőzinlügüün* (Xw 2) ‘with the word of the gods’; *täprülär ordoları titrîyür* ‘the palaces of the gods are trembling’.

Another instance where both head and satellite are in the plural (the head being marked by possessive suffix) is *bo yâgîlar kizların ... biçip kâşip* (MaitH Y 211) ‘cutting up (the bodies of) these daughters of enemies’. Even satellites shown to be definite by having possessive suffixes do not have to be in the genitive, e.g. *oglum savi* (KP 63,2) ‘news from my son’ or *çim bâlgüsi* (HTs III 318) ‘the mark of my footprint’. These contents are not, of course, very well described with the label ‘possessive’, since no possession is involved.

In some cases, what looks like this construction may be one nominal phrase only at first sight; the following sentence could instead be an instance of the ‘construction with two subjects’ (discussed in section 4.4): *antag antag yertä bir köl savi sugulup on miy bâflkâr künkü köyüp ...* (Suv 603,11) could signify ‘what happened to a lake in some particular place was that its waters got drained and 10,000 fish got burned by the sun’. The relationship between *bir köl* and *savî* would then be not one of government within a single nominal phrase but one of apposition; *bir köl* might have been mentioned as topic while *savî* would be the actual subject of *sugul-*. 
Relatively rarely the attribute stands in the genitive although the head has no possessive suffix. This happens in the inscriptions (e.g. mäni ār ‘my men’; Yegân Silig bägiň kädümüg torug at ‘the harnessed bay horse of S. bäg, the khan’s nephew’ in KT E33), most often in lamaistic texts of the 14th century. Further examples are sänig alümüň alinky ‘Your creditor came’ (UigBrief D 6, a person al letter) and biziň beşi üzär ‘our 500 men’ (KP 53,4-6). In instances in Classical Uygur, the satellite is often a highly honored person or entity; e.g.: eligimiz kütinig idok y(a)r(i)g üzär (HTs VIII 58) ‘by the holy order of his majesty our king’ or t(a)ıpré bürxannay bir p(a)dkêa tägilig nom (U III 29,16-17) ‘as (little as) one verse from the divine Buddha’s teaching’. In Manichaean texts: t(ä)ıprérim, m(a)ıni sızı́n yultuuz[a] körüp kololap ... (M III nr.13 v7) ‘My lord, I have viewed and observed your star ...’; sızı́n üdürümüš friştilär ‘your chosen messengers’; sız tüdımlig xanları́nğ tüz yiltıza sız (Wettkampf 49) ‘You are from the root of crowned kings’. Two hymn titles, vam värınuy beşi ‘the hymn of the god Vam’ and b(ary rol(a)n zaw(a)r žirfinuy bašta ‘the hymn to god, light, power and wisdom’ (M II 9 and 10 respectively) show the same structure.

Sometimes heads appear without possessive suffix and attributes in the nominative although the relationship is neither appositional nor adjectival, as in balık kapagda olor- (KP 64,7) ‘to sit at the city gate’ or beş azım tönlüqlar ‘the beings of the five existences’. kün orto ‘noon’ would seem to be of the same type, as its literal meaning is ‘the middle of the day’.

There is an adnominal partitive locative with referential satellite, as in ol yläklärä dülagi (ManUigFr r5) ‘the leader of those demons’.

As a rule, the genitive precedes its head; this was the case in all the examples quoted. An occasional exception occurs e.g. in Windg, which has åkinti / üčünč / törtünč / bëšinč ärdüm(i) săvınč(i)577 yel täprü küünüň ‘the second / third / fourth / fifth virtue and joy of the power of the wind god’ as titles of text sections. The text is a translation from Parthian and the translator clearly copied the word order of his source, in which all the corresponding phrases follow their head as well. Making the genitives precede would have pushed the ordinals out of the prominent first position.

577 There are some lacunas in the text but it is also clear that there is an intended stylistic variation, the possessive suffix being either present on both terms, present only on the second (making that an instance of group inflection) or absent on both.
4.122. Nominal phrases with descriptive satellite

When satellites do not refer to a possessor, do not quantify and are not deictic they describe the head. When neither the satellite nor the head have any morphology, the satellite is most often an adjective, as in Orkhon Turkic yımšak agï ‘soft textile’. Heads can also be adjectives governing other terms, e.g. degree adverbs. Further expansions of adjectives have the shape -gAll uçu ‘easy to ...’ and -gAll tägümiliğ ‘worthy of ...’; where they govern the supine; examples for this construction are mentioned in section 4.23.

In a case like beş yüz tâmir talkuklar (U III 47.8) ‘500 iron pegs’ the attribute is the name of some matter, like ‘iron’ or ‘wood’. Such attributes have at least some adjective characteristics; cf. German ‘eisern’, French ‘en fer’.

In other instances the attribute is a proper name, e.g. orkon ögüz ‘the Orkhon river’, ram ay, the name of a month, or kögmän tag ‘the Sayan mountain (range)’, or the whole phrase is a proper name, as yel tägürı ‘the Wind God’, suk yâk ‘the Demon of Greed’. The attribute in takigu yîl ‘the year of the hen’ is a proper name in a sense, as no real hen was probably denoted: To the Old Turks, the association of years with particular animals was presumably already arbitrary.

Kulum küüm bodun ‘the nation (consisting of) my male and female slaves’ (SU S9) and köl tegin atïsï yollug tegin ‘Yollug tegin, the nephew of Köl tegin’ (KT SE) are instances of apposition; the satellite here refers to the same entity as its head, unlike possessive satellites: kulum küüm and bodun, köl tegin atïsï and yollug tegin are coreferential. With kedîn [äñät]käk yerintä (HTs VIII 11) we know only because of the context that we should not translate it as ‘in the country of western India’ but as ‘in the west (as seen from China, where the text was written), in India’. Note that ‘in the west’ is not kedîntä, the locative suffix being applied only once, after the second element: It turns out that apposition applies group inflexion to noun phrases as well. Appositions can also follow the head, e.g. yaşovatî künçynlar ärdinisi (Mait 51r31) ‘Yangovatî, the jewel of ladies’ with a metaphorical phrase. Yegädimäk utmak bolzun maŋa âgdok kari petkäçi mar işoyazd maxistak üzü ‘May I, the worthless old scribe, attain everlasting life through his holiness the maxistak Işoyazd’ (M I 28.19) shows an apposition in the nominative, âgdok kari petkäçi, to maŋa, a pronoun in the dative case. Even a whole clause can be an apposition, e.g. the one with ârtökîn as head in apposition to munî in the following instance: munî körüp bodisatv, montag osoglug ârtökîn, ... ärtiqü körkdî
sezinti (Suv 630,10) ‘He saw this, the bodhisattva, i.e. that this was the situation, and became exceedingly frightened ... and worried.’

The most elaborate descriptive satellites are the adnominal relative clauses; these are described in section 4.61 and its subsections.

A further way to link nominals is for the satellite to get the suffix +lXg with no suffix on the head. Such instances can be classified into two main groups: Either the two nominals have two distinct referents or they refer to the same entity. In a first type, the content of the satellite can be said to be ‘at’ the content of the head, or the latter to ‘have’ the former; e.g. didiğli̇g başlar ‘crowned heads’ (Mait) or, with inalienable possession, ağı̇l̄çȯl tı̇̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̂
metaphor for the satellite. In *sansāra*-whirlpool’ the whirlpool serves as metaphor for the manner in which souls are, according to Buddhist doctrine, whirled around among the various this- and otherworldly ways of existence. Buddhist Uygur literature shows numerous and often quite involved examples of extended metaphors which make use of +lXg. OTWF § 2.91 has more details on this formative; the uses listed above are the syntactic ones.

The relationship between *kan* and *ögüz* in *tünliez* ölüür, türisin soyar, *kan* ögüz akıtar (KP 2,4) ‘They kill living beings, flay their skin and spill rivers of blood’ can be called metaphorical quantification.

Then there is the Old Turkic *bahtürhind* construction, where the satellite itself is a nominal clause whose topic includes reference to the head. Here is an example, where *köz*, the topic of the satellite clause *közi yarok* ‘his eye is bright’ has the possessive suffix to refer to *idoklar* ‘the saints’: *közi yarok* idoklarka bargil yakın (ETŞ 12,18, verse) ‘Go close to the bright eyed saints.’ Such complex attributes can also be used predicatively; e.g. *sav+i* süzük and *köül+i* kağı in *savi* süzük *köülti kağı* temiş siz (HTs VII 2128) ‘You are said to be clear of discourse and firm of heart’, or *köül+i* öğrüncülüğ ‘joyed of heart’ in ol ödün yağı w(o)rm(ï)z bo sav[a] ötrü köülü öğrüncülüğ bölmüdï (Wettkampf 73) ‘Then the valiant Wormïzt no longer enjoyed this matter’. In the following sentence (Warnke 434-439) three *bahtürhind* alternate with +lXg and adjective satellites: *ayayu* tuadaçlar uzun yaš+lği bolgu apir inčï yana öz+i köşga bolmïslerï közünür; *yavïz* ya(ý)vtak [fö]la(t)çë etitiçi kïsilïr köşa yaš+lği bolgu apir öz+i uzun bolmïslerï közünür; arig süzük köül+i yiğoilug [kişï]lïr ârtïnïy bay barïm+lığ bolgu apir inçï yana égay [...]+lığ bolmïslerï közünür ‘Those who care about honour should have long lives but in fact their lives turn out to be short; evil and murderous persons should have short lives but it turns out that their lives are long; people who are pure and serious should be very rich but instead they turn out to be poor’. The *bahtürhind* construction helps underline the contrast between *kïsïga*, the predicate of the first sentence, and *uzun*, the predicate of the second. See Erdal 1998b for further thoughts on this.

Local expressions ending in +dXn or +rA appear in adnominal use, e.g. *ikidin* ayağusintä ‘from his ribs on both sides’ (DKPAMPb 207), *taštin* iincükä *ün* (KP 5,4) ‘to go out for a pleasure outing’ (from *iki* ‘two’ and *taš* ‘outside’ respectively) or *asra* mansïz sakïnëlïr ‘humble unassuming thoughts’ (TT II,2 68). Other local and temporal constructions are made adnominal by +kl, as elaborated upon in section 3.126; e.g. *yazkï* ârûmiy yuka buz (HTs VII 731) ‘the thin melted ice of
spring’. Partitive meaning can be expressed by adding $+dA+kl$ to the satellite and having `birisi ‘one of them’ or some other head with a possessive suffix; e.g. *immelun šastrē ārsār inēip samtso ačari āvirmiš ānākēčē biiglārdēki biriši ārūr* (HTs VIII 29) ‘As for the Yin ming lun šāstra, it is one among the Indian writings translated by Xuanzang’; *tört buluŋtēkē ādgūsi uyurē terilipān mūnjīvēr* (IrqB 28) ‘The best and most capable people among those of the whole world assemble (there) and rejoice’.

It happens that postpositional phrases are used adnominally, e.g. in *yugant údtākē tēg ulug bādūk ot yalinlar közinūr* (MaitH XX 1r12) ‘There appear fires and flames as big and tall as in the yugānta age’; the phrase *yugant údtākē tēg* here qualifies either the two adjectives *ulug bādūk* ‘big and tall’ or the noun phrase *binome ot yalinlar* ‘fires and flames’. The sentence *ada čćū(r)gē ucēn sakīnē ayu berālim* (TT VA 75), does not signify ‘Let us tell (you) thoughts so (you) can allay dangers’ but ‘Let us inform you of the meditation (serving) the allayment of dangers’; the postpositional phrase is, again, adnominal, qualifying *sakīnē*. This is shown by the context, where other meditations serving different purposes are mentioned. Postpositional phrases are dealt with in section 4.21, where we mention two instances of adnominal *birlē* phrases (one qualifying an adjective, another a noun). A very special type of construction dealt with there is that around the element *ulatī*, which is used when the head names a set, of which one or more members are to be mentioned attributively:

Examples of this can be translated either as ‘my classmates, including (or ‘above all’) John’ or ‘John and my other classmates’; note that, in the second type (where *ulatī* governs the locative and not the nominative) English cannot make the ‘classmates’ into the construction’s head.

Two nominal attributes can be linked by *ār-ip*, a verb of the copula; e.g. *aglak ārip könjūkē yarašī oron* (BT VII A361) ‘a solitary place which is beneficial to the heart’; *sērmālip akar svulug ārip sāp sām aglakata* (UigStab A10) ‘in an absolutely isolated place with pure flowing water’; *utpal ōŋlūg ārip iki kollug, on elīgintā vačēr tudačē ... ulug kučēlūg maxakalaka yūkūnūr bīz* (BT XIII 25,15) ‘We bow to mighty Mahākāla, lotus coloured, two armed, holding the vajra in his right hand ...’. There are further examples for this in UW 408-9, §36 of the entry for *ār-*.\(^{578}\) None of the instances are pre-classical.

\(^{578}\) Röhborn writes ‘zur Trennung von komplexen Attributen ... ungleicher innerer Struktur,’ but the attributes in the last mentioned example are identical in structure. The
Consider finally the noun phrase bököń bar yaran yok bâksiz mäğişüz ätiäöz ‘the fickle and transient body which is here today and gone tomorrow’ (r12 in a Mait colophon reedited by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133): The attributes bököń bar and yaran yok show the predicates bar ‘existent’ and yok ‘non-existent’ used attributively and accompanied by temporal adverbs and thus come close to being verbless relative clauses (cf. their translation).

4.123. Nominal phrases with deictic satellite
Beside their pronominal function, the demonstratives bo and ol are also common as (‘pro-adjectival’) satellites, and then do not get inflected for case or number: There is no satellite concord in Old Turkic.579

When a noun is accompanied by both a demonstrative and one or more adjectives, the demonstrative normally precedes the adjective or the adnominal noun. The inverse order is, however, possible, as in umugusz İnasız bo tünliqlar ‘these hopeless and destitute creatures’ (U II 4,7, in a rather early text), aklançığ utun bo sansar (BT III 902, a quite late source) ‘this repulsive and shameless sansâra’ or (perhaps by poetic licence, for the sake of the rote-rhyme) arığ gadírakud ol tagta (BT XIII 7,1) ‘on that pure Grânrikûta mountain’.

Interrogative-indefinite pronouns are also used attributively, both in their interrogative and their indefinite uses. Here is an example for indefinite nü used in a correlative pair: nâ ymä taştïn siðarki bâlgulïrig nâ ymä içtïn siðarki [bâlgulïrig] adрук adruk tülïrig koduru kololasar (MaitH XI 3r 29-30) ‘if one meticulously examines whatever external and internal signs there are as well as the different dreams’. Indefinite kaç and kayu can also serve adnominally.

The reflexive pronouns käntü and öz appear in adnominal use both in their nominative and their genitive forms and then signify ‘own’; examples for this are quoted in section 3.133. Where Orkhon Turkic has attributive käntü to show that the head is assigned (‘belongs’) to the sentence topic, Uygur uses öz instead. A further way to rheumatise possession is through the genitives of personal and demonstrative pronouns (sometimes combined with öz). Attributional demonstratives and possessive pronouns can be used together in one noun phrase, as in mäniŋ ol kaştïm xan ‘that father of mine, the king’ (KP 16,1).

579 There appears to be a single exception in bolar yalqolklar ‘these persons’ (Fedakâr 239); the language of the mss. in Sogdian script is aberrant in other ways as well.
4.124. Nominal phrases with quantifying satellite

Numerals are joined to their head without marker, e.g. eki šad (BQ E 21) ‘two shads (a title)’; but names used for referring to tribal confederations such as Üç Karlok, Tokuz Tatar or Sükiz Öğuz are not normal quantifications unless shortened from üc (karlok bodun) ‘the three Karlok peoples’ > (üc karlok) bodun ‘the Three Karlok people’. Numerals demand no number agreement in that heads do not have to be in the plural, e.g. üc otuz balık (Tuñ 19) ‘23 cities’. In Uygur, however, it is not rare to find the plural suffix in nouns accompanied by number words, often when referring to well-known and closed groups; e.g. ol ıč yäklärig anx(a)rw(a)z(a)nta badd (M I 19,1) ‘He bound those three demons to the zodiac’; on mığ balıklar (Suv 603,11) ‘10,000 fish’; sükiz tünän tört mığ ... balıklar ‘84000 ... towns’; altı közlüg bulun alıp ‘taking six girls as prisoners’ (MaitH Y 204). [kal]ığ ığrak bürtgülü yumšak iki âmigläri (TT X 445) ‘her two breasts, firm (but) soft to touch’ shows a numeral following other attributes.

Zieme 1969: 97 put together the material for the appearance of +lAr with nouns in Manichaean texts, when these nouns are qualified by numerals or by the quantity words kamag, kop and alku all signifying ‘all’ and üküş ‘many’ and amari ‘a few, some, a part’. It turns out that, in the sources reviewed, the vast majority of nouns referring to humans or to mythological beings (with the exception of beș täṛi, which signifies ‘the fivefold god’ and not ‘five gods’ in Manichaean mythology) have +lAr when quantified. When these elements qualify referring to other entities, these do not, in those texts, normally get the suffix +lAr. On the other hand the singular is by no means excluded with the first group and the plural not at all excluded with the second. More work clearly needs to be done on this matter.\footnote{Predicative nominals are generally not put into the plural even when referring to humans, as ol kızlar kapagüğü biz tep ted. ... kapagücü kirkın biz tedilar (KP 41,5-42,6) ‘Those girls said ‘We are doorkeepers.’” ... They said “We are female doorkeeper servants.”’}

In alku bizını barça utup yeğâdp (U IV A 266) ‘surpassing all of us’ the head is a personal pronoun: ‘allness’ is here expressed both by alku and barça, but alku is attributive to biz while barça is predicative. In anı alku ökmüür biz (TT IV A76) ‘We repent all of that’ the head is a demonstrative, if I understand it correctly to be qualified by alku.

A further quantifying adnominal construction, described in OTWF section 3.106, uses deverbal nouns in -(X)m: är turumü suv (DLT) ‘water the depth of a standing man’ from tur- ‘to stand’ is construed just like sünţig batını kar (KT E 35 and BQ E 26) ‘lance-deep snow’
from *bat* ‘to go under’. *yüz čiğin uzun iğač* (DKPAMPb 1345) ‘a plank which is a hundred feet long’ shows that lexemes other than -(X)jm forms were also possible in the construction described there.

We have Orkhon Turkic examples for the addition of approximative +cA to adnominal numerals, *ağıcá är* ‘about 50 men’ in Tuñ 42 and *yüzcä ärin* ‘with approximately 100 men’ in BQ E37. Cf. further *eki üc kišiliği* ‘with 2 or 3 people’ in BQ E41 and *eki üc bin sümüz* (Tuñ 14) ‘long as on this day’ we find an equative form (see section 3.126 for what precedes the equative suffix) qualifying an adjective.581

In *sän öürmiščä tínliglar* ‘as many creatures as you have killed’ (Suv 15,18), *bo bišurmiščä äktärig ... yenlär* (BT XIII 3,53) ‘eat (pl.) up this cooked meat’, *akmičča kankarın yalgayur* (BT XIII 3,75) ‘She licks up the blood which comes out’ and *bulmišča sudarlariğ šastrlar阿里g üloł yeartic üça aktaruu ärür biz* (HTs VII 1021) ‘By holy (i.e. imperial) order we are translating as many *sütiras* and *şåstras* as we can find’ the adnominal quantifying equative subordinates a headless relative clause of the type discussed in section 4.622. Attributive -gU+cA expresses accordance, degree or limit: *yakiši urü körgiçčä yer* (TT X 512) ‘a place for the *yakşa* boy to see (what was happening)’, *ärják učm sançgıcča yer oron* (MaitH XV 2r8) ‘a place the size of a hole (sanç- ‘to pierce’) one would make by the tip of one’s finger’ or *nacá taplasar, tükägıcčä tavar algıl* (U III 47,19) ‘Take as much goods as you wish to the degree of using them up’; there is another instance of *tükägıcča* in KP 4,1-4.

4.2. Adjunct phrases

Adjunct phrases are distinguished from adjuncts in that the latter are a cluster of parts of speech comprising adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions and particles, whereas the former are sentence parts defined by their syntactic function. Adverbs (discussed in section 3.31) are the part of speech whose task it is to serve as adjunct; adverbs can therefore serve as adjunct phrases as nouns can serve as nominal phrases. Postpositions, on the other hand, are, as such, *heads* of adjunct phrases; a number of them can be used as adverbs by themselves and some postpositional phrases can serve as satellites in nominal phrases.

---

581 I take the form *sukigînca* in *ärják sukigînca üldü* (Maitr 197v12 and elsewhere) ‘in the time it takes to snap one’s finger’, i.e. ‘in a moment’ not to consist of the -gInA gerund of suk- but to have been formed by transparently adding the possessive and equative suffix to suk-g. -gInA was apparently created in the same way (cf. section 3.286) but was clearly already fused in the earliest texts.
As postpositions they cannot be adjunct phrases by themselves. Relational nouns, again, can be used by themselves as adjunct phrases only inasmuch as they can also be used as postpositions (as happens with ara `intervening stretch') and can dispense with possessive suffixes. Noun phrases in some case forms, e.g. the instrumental, also often serve as adjunct phrases.

Adjunct phrases must be distinguished also from adjunct clauses, discussed in section 4.63 (and subsections). The phrases in the construction found in qiqitā āt āzīn `with bowing body', kūkārā āzīn `with smiling face', titrayū āzin `with a shaking voice', yašru kūlān `with secret intentions', titrayū or kamayu āzīn `with a shaking body', tālmīrā kōzin `with languishing eyes', tikā kūlgākīn `with cocked ears' or yincurū topūn yūkūn- `to do obeisance' seem to me to be adjunct phrases by form but adjunct clauses by meaning: They always have a body part, the body as a whole or an abstract inalienable entity in the instrumental case as kernel and a vowel converb referring to the activity in which that body part etc. is involved used adnominally; what is expressed is, however, something carried out in conjunction with the main activity. See OTWF p.770, note 506 for references to the passages where these phrases are found.

There are a number of adjunct phrases in the sentence nācādā temin āqilārīn ārō kōtūrīn ulug āzin ulīdīlār (Suv 619,18-20) `At some stage, a short while after that they regained their senses, they raised their hands and wailed loudly'. nācādā is a temporal indefinite pronoun, temin and ārō are temporal adverbs but ārō also serves as postposition, ārō describes the direction of movement in space and the instrumental case form of the phrase ulug āzin `large voice' describes manner; ārō and ārō are petrified converbs. āqilārīn ārō kōtūrīn might be an adjunct clause (see section 4.631).

Converbs themselves should, of course, also be defined as adjunct phrases when they are not adjunct clauses. Take the sentence t(qә)riniŋ ulug kūlūg sārisī arvīsī ol yākīk [b]āṣa ātār (M III nr.3 r 13-14) `The great strong and terrible spell of the god … holds down that demon'. bas-ā582 `pressing', here translated as `down', merely qualifies the verb and must be considered to be part of the single main clause; the two verbs describe one and the same action.

The following two sentences (MaitH XX 1r2 and 10 respectively) show various types of adjuncts which are syntagms and not single adverbial lexemes, qualify the action and do not represent entities

\[582\] Not to be confused with the similarly formed adverb – postposition – relational noun, which has a different meaning.
participating in it: yer suvlar suv üzäki kemi osoglug altï törlüg täprüyüür kamşayurlar ‘The worlds shake and rock in six ways, like a ship on water’; kuvrag yiğilmișta ken turum ara tördin yiğak ulug tğiği ün kügü eştilir ‘After the congregation assembles, suddenly a big sound and noise is heard from four directions’. There is, first, the noun phrase altï törlüg ‘of six types’ unmarked for case, which might also qualify nominal heads but is here used adverbially. Then there are the four phrases suv üzäki kemi osoglug, kuvrag yiğilmișta ken, tördin yiğak and turum ara, of the type which has been called exocentric, which cannot be used for reference to arguments of propositions. The first of these phrases describes the manner in which the event referred to takes place, as does altï törlüg. tördin yiğak describes the source from which the sounds referred to in the second sentence are heard, the four points of the compass in fact being understandable as ‘all directions’. yiğak is, in fact, a noun; it is so used e.g. in ozgu kutrulgu yol yiğakig ol nomta aśidip … (Pothi 63), where ozgu kutrulgu yol yiğak is ‘the way to salvation’. Cf. the definition törti yiğak tört buňug sãkiz yiğak bolur (TT V A 62) ‘The four directions and the four corners make the eight cardinal points’. The use of yiğak in törttin yiğak is very similar to that of the postposition sığar dealt with below, which also has nominal uses. kuvrag yiğilmișta ken and turum ara are temporal expressions, the first specifying the point in time in which the main event takes place, the second its (short) duration. turum ara is a set phrase signifying ‘immediately, on the spot’, documented in UW 172 b under ara, § B e; it could therefore be listed in the lexicon as a unit, if Uygar has no instances of turum except in this phrase (but cf. turum ‘height while standing’ in the DLT). The phrase does, nevertheless, have a transparent structure, ara ‘between, among’ being in Old Turkic primarily used as a postposition. It is, however, also used as an adverb in the phrases için ara biliš- ‘to be acquainted with each other’, ara tur- and ara kir-, both ‘to intercede’,583 and as a relational noun e.g. in U III 13,7-9-: k(al)tï yultuzlar arasïnta a ğ [tilgäni] nätäg yëlä g yalin(ï)g közünür ârsar ançulayu ymä elig bög olarnïn arasïnta çoglug yalin(ï)g közünï ‘The king appeared among them brilliant and resplendent as the moon appears brilliant and resplendent among the stars’. The postposition ken ‘after’, which we find in the phrase kuvrag yiğilmișta ken, can also be used as an adverb signifying ‘afterwards’; similarly the postposition birlä ‘with’, which then has the meaning ‘together’. The internal structure of kuvrag yiğilmișta ken is that of a postpositional

583 ‘Interceding for each other’ is ara kiriš-, to be bracketed as (ara kir-)iş-. All these phrases are documented in UW 171a under ara (I) § A,e.
phrase; as shown by the translation ‘after the congregation assembles’, it can, however, also be considered a clause equivalent: Thus if -mštA ken is classified as a complex gerund suffix; adjunct clauses are discussed in section 4.63 below. The two sentences we looked at show a variety of adjunct phrases and some of the uses to which they are put; they also reveal some of the definition problems to be encountered in trying to describe them.

Many elements have a number of syntactic functions. adín ‘different’, below presented as a postposition, could also be regarded as an adjective in all its uses, since its government of nouns follows from its content. The postposition öŋi is also used adnominally, in the meaning ‘various’; [isig] özün[guž][lärni (?) öŋi kapip eltgäy (U III 14,4) ‘he will snatch away your lives’ shows öŋi in adverbial use. basa basa is used adverbially, and then signifies ‘gradually’ or (in MaitH XV Nachtr 1r14) ‘continuously’. The overlap between postpositions and relational nouns, which also exists, is documented in section 4.22. Some elements have all three functions, e.g. ara discussed above or tägrä ‘around’: tägrä tolî is used adverbially in expressions such as tägrä tolî tāgzinür (Xw 48) ‘they revolve round and round’ or tägrä tolî tururlar ārdilär (KP 71,4) ‘They were standing round him’; there is an adverbial tägrä in yağünüz tägrä očok tāg ārti (Tuñ 8) ‘Our enemies were all around (us) like an oven (and we were in the middle like food)’. Instances of the bare stem tägrä governing nominals in the nominative are mentioned below; finally we have tägrä as auxiliary nominal, e.g. in tägri burxan tägräsindä (TT X 349-50). The only thing tägrä apparently cannot do is to be used adnominally; for that it receives the converter +kI, as in kānt tägräki bodun bokun (TT X 51) ‘the population in the town’s suburbs’ or, with zero government as in the Tuñ example just quoted, tägräki tapigičrä (U II 22,2) ‘the servants surrounding (her)’. In tägräki birlä yükântačilär (HTs III 942) ‘those praying with (him) who were around (him)’ both tägrä and birlä get the same governed entity from the context.

Adjunct clauses are, in section 4.63, classified according to meaning. We could have done this also with adjunct phrases and dealt with phrases referring to place, time, circumstance, manner, comparison, aim, participant structure, source or means. Had we done that, we would (as done with the clauses) have had to mention elements such as tägrä ‘around; concerning’ or üzä ‘above’ vs. agentive ‘by’ under more than one heading: one meaning local, the other abstract.
4.21. Postposition constructions

Adjunct phrases are often construed around postpositions (equivalent to prepositions of some other languages but following the nominals which they govern), a limited set of elements which govern nominals though they are not verbs. I have called nouns which similarly form adjunct phrases by governing noun phrases relational nouns; these are dealt with in the next section. Proper postpositions are much more similar to adverbs than to nominals in lacking inflexion; when not governing noun phrases they function as adverbs.

Postpositional constructions normally qualify verbs; they can, however, also qualify adjectives or nouns: In kök kalik birlâ tâg tûz (UigTot 1378) ‘equal to the sky’ a postpositional phrase is governed by an adjectival binome, as English equal governs a prepositional phrase in the translation. In mağa tâqlig kîşi ‘a person like me’ (TT X 499) a postpositional phrase qualifies a noun. Another difference between these two expressions is that tâg tûz opens a slot for a birlâ phrase in the same sense that the cooperative-reciprocal opens a slot for a birlâ phrase.

Most of the postpositions govern the nominative (i.e. stem) form of nominals. These are tâg ‘like, as’, birlâ ‘with’ (e.g. Xormuzta tâqri beš tâqri birlâ ... kälti ‘The god Ohrmizd came with the fivefold god’ in Xw 2; inscriptive tatar birlâ tokî: ‘to clash with the Mongols’), ucün ‘for; because of’ (e.g. nâ ucün ‘why; what for’, bursay kuvaruc ucün ‘for the congregation’ in Mait 71v27), utru (e.g. Xilimbî yûk utru bardî ‘He advanced against the demon Hiðimba’ in U II 26,17), töni ‘during’ (examples in Zieme 1992) and tapa ‘towards’ (e.g. tâqri elig tapa

584 Old Turkic postpositions do not govern adverbs or adverb equivalents; ‘as before’ is therefore ögräkti tâg (BT XIII 8,10-12), not ‘ögrä tâg’.

585 And its Oğuz counterpart kepî mentioned in the DLT (fol.471 korum kepî ‘like a boulder’, 243 kaḷlar kepî ‘like birds’ etc.), < kep ‘mould’ + possessive suffix.

586 Gabain 1974: 142 (§301) quotes “barînît ucün” from Radloff’s edition of the Yenisey inscriptions; Radloff had transcribed this as barmay ucün (with an A which he did not transcribe following the word ucün). The passage occurs in E11,3, with Vasil’ev 1983:20 emending away the g (presumably because he was aware that ucün does not govern nouns without possessive suffix in the accusative form): Both Kormušîn in 1997: 273 and Kurt Wulf in his unpublished edition of this inscription read b’r’mg’ ̕vît’w y’îk’l r’vîk’l; I accept this especially since the two readings are independent of each other. Understanding the passage is more difficult. Kormušîn takes tû to signify ‘kind’ (this meaning being attested several times in Karakhanid) and thinks that uc tü yîlki are three kinds of livestock – horses, cows and sheep. He may be nearly right. The phrase may refer to pack, riding and draught animals such as camels, horses and donkeys (cows and sheep are not yîlki), ucün, at any rate, must here be a misreading.
Syntaxis

`towards the divine ruler' in M III nr.27 r1). Very many examples of ara ‘between, among, mutual’ are listed and partly quoted in UW 170-172, which we therefore need not do here. ikin ara is in fact often used as ara by itself, e.g. in vig aš ornï bišag [a]š ornï ikin ara ‘between the place of raw food and of digested food’ (MaitH XV Nachtr 4r24) or iki ämiği ikin ara ‘between her two breasts’ (Mait 33r21). tägrä is used as a postposition, e.g. in känt tägräki bodun bokun (TT X 51-2) ‘the people around the town’: We find the phrase ätööätägrä körsär used in parallel with ig tapa körsär in TT I 219-220, signifying ‘if you examine (the oracle) concerning your body’ and ‘concerning an illness’ respectively, i.e. with the same meaning as tapa. yokaru is normally an adverb, but in TT V A 4-11 we find it to govern nouns in the nominative: tiz yokaru belkä tlägi suv ulug titir ... bel yokaru kökän äginäkä tägi ot ulug tetir ... ägin yokaru saç kidiginka tägi yel ulug tetir
‘From the knee upwards till the waist (the element) water is said to dominate... From the waist up till the breast and the shoulder fire is said to dominate ... From the shoulder upward till the edge of the hair (the element) wind is considered to dominate’. In t(a)mudan yokaru agdokta (M I 13.15) ‘when they rose up from hell’ yokaru can be considered an adverb. art-ök ‘more’ can, already in Orkhon Turkic, govern the nominative of quantitative terms: yarïkïnta yalmasïnta yüz artok okun urtï (KT E33) ‘(They) hit him by his armour and his cloak with more than a hundred arrows’. Similarly in Uygar sïrlar kamag m[i]γ beş yüz artok, tawçanlar [kužatbirdar ič yüz artok; ... içtirtin ünmiš ... iki yüz artok burxan[la]r ... (HTs VII 1111-1114) ‘The ... poles were all in all more than 1500, the sedan chairs and tents more than 300; more than 200 ... Buddha (figures) which had appeared from inside ...’ or bir ay artok açïntï (KP 68,2) ‘They took care of him for more than a month’. bir tsun artok (HTs III 975) is ‘more than an inch’. Normally artok is an adverb governing the ablative locative or (e.g. in BT VIII 143) the ablative.

eyin ‘as a result of; according to’ can govern two different case forms with no apparent difference in meaning: We have the nominative in the Manichæan ms. U 122a v4 (edited in Zieme 1969: 198) and TT II,2 26, 27, 35, 46 and 82 (e.g. öpkä bilig eyin ‘as a result of wrath’) and in Buddhist üd eyin (Suv 596,22), ayig törö eyin âvriel- (U III 79,4), or tägrï burxan eyin bar- (TT VIII A 17) ‘to follow the divine Buddha’; the phrase köjïl eyin ‘to one’s heart’s desire’ is especially common. However, it governs the dative in nizvanïlärkâ eyin (Pothi 203, also Manichæan but later), bo yöürgkä eyin bol- (HTsBiogr 188) ‘to accord with this view’, ayig ögilîrïkä eyin bol- (Suv 101,18) and e.g. in TT
VIII A 16, 46, ETŞ 13,24 and 16,43. In TT VI 196 one ms. has ayğ kılınč eyn bar- where another writes kılınčka instead.

kuď governs the nominative in sülənə kuď ‘down the Selenga (river)’ in BQ E37 and ŠU E4, but the locative or (more often) the ablative in the rest of Old Turkic. kuď comes from kud- ‘to pour’ because liquids move downwards, including the river mentioned in this example. The contexts in question thus show the word in its original function, and we do not know whether it retained its government of the nominative once its use was extended to cover downward movement in general.

täğ is the postposition which has the closest juncture with the nouns it governs: It is often spelled together with them (see examples below) and even becomes a case suffix with some pronouns (governing the oblique stem and not the accusative form and following synharmonism). täğ and üčûn are never used as adverbs nor as relational nouns, and there are some indications that üčûn may (like täğ) have had phonically close juncture with what it governs in some Yenisey inscriptions.

There are four postpositions formed with +Ixg which do not yet appear in inscriptive or in Manichæan Turkic: täglîg appears to be exclusively Buddhist while osoglûg, yanğîg and tägîmlîg are in addition found in Qarakhanid Turkic. tânlığ, which generally governs the equative, and tägîmlîg, which governs the dative, are dealt with below. osoglûg and yanğîg govern the nominative, e.g. taloy ögüz osoglûg ‘similar to the sea’; siğîrgâlîr osoglûg kılın- in U I 41, ‘to behave as if one were to swallow somebody’, nà yanğîg ‘in what way’ both in Uygur (e.g. TT VIII A2) and Qarakhanid. What is peculiar about osoglûg and yanğîg is that they also govern the pronominal forms formed with the postposition-turned-case-suffix +tAg, e.g. montag yanğîg ‘in this way’ frequently in the Suv or in BT XIII 13,111, mondag osoglûg (TT VIII A37) or nätäg osoglûg (U I 57,6). Being practically synonymous with täğ, osoglûg and yanğîg may have come up to strengthen the meaning of täğ and to make it more explicit. Similarly tânlîg appears to have emerged because of the need to make quantitative +ćA more explicit and focussed.

When the postpositions mentioned hitherto govern demonstrative or personal pronouns or the pronoun kâm/kim ‘who’, the governed pronoun appears in the accusative form, e.g. mûnt tâg ‘like this’ (Pothen 104) biznî tâg (common) ‘like us’, biznî ara (M I 10,2), siznî birlâ ‘with you’ (TT II 1 1) or kimnî üzâ ‘over whom’ (M III 22,11, nr.8). sînî ücûn (Mait 77v5) and sînî ücûn (M III nr.7 I v2, nr.18 v15) ‘for you’,
The postposition *ara* governs the genitive in *olar* *ara* ‘among them’ (MaitH XXI 3v5, XXIII 12r6), though it otherwise governs the accusative of pronouns. This may have come up in analogy to the relational noun constructions, where the genitive is the only admissible case for pronouns. Remember that *ara* is originally a noun and that it was also used as relational noun. The demonstrative pronoun appears in the genitive also in the common phrase *anï* *ara* ‘in the meantime’ (in MaitH XX 1v3 and elsewhere). In Qarakhanid Turkic the accusative is replaced by the genitive altogether, e.g. in *mäni* *tapa* ‘towards me’, *anï* *bir* *ara* ‘with him’, *anï* *kepi* ‘like him’ (DLT). This development is echoed by the genitive being used also as alternative oblique base in those sources, as e.g. *sänïdä*, *anïdïn* or even *sänïsiz*. Cf. also already *anï* *utru* turdaçë yok (U IV A283) ‘There is no one to stand against him’.

The same postpositions governing the accusative forms of pronouns also govern the accusative of nominals with 2nd or 3rd person possessive suffix, as *elin* *icra* ‘in their realm’ (M III 19,15), *käntü* *körül* *icra* *tari*- ‘to plant into their own hearts’ (M III nr.8 VII r3); *ordolar* *icra* ‘in their palaces’ (Ms. U 267a I r1-4 quoted in the n. to BT V 214); *őzintäg*, *ortosöntäg*, *oröntäg* and *olorgusöntäg* (spelled thus in BT V 175-6), *yarok* *täg* (M II 8,13); *bir* *äki* *atılıg* *yavla* *učün* ‘because one or two knights were wicked’ or *antag* *učün* (KT S8 = BQ N6) ‘because you are like that’, *armak* *učün* (KT E6), *tömgös* *učün* ‘even though they are foolish’ (Mait 2r2), *yerin* *tapa* ‘in the direction of his place’ (ŠU S6), *käntü* *atözin* *üzä* (M III nr.8V r4) ‘by his own body’, *zruč* *burxan* *töpös* *üzä* (ManUigFrag v3) ‘on the head of the prophet Zarathustra’, *kamaguç* *učün* ‘over all of you’ (M III nr.27 r18; for a long time misread), *ot* *bir* *lala* ‘with their herbs’ (M I 15,6-7), *täprü* *grön* *utru* ‘before the purity of the gods’ (quoted in Zieme 1969: 127), *ay* *täprü* *kün* *sau* ‘on every Monday (< moon day)’ (Xw 183).

587 r8 according to Wilkens 2000: 229.
588 The same phrase with *icra* should be read also in nr.8 IV r15, where the editor writes *körül* *učün* [a]fra tik-tari-.
589 Replaced in the (linguistically) later Hami ms. (Yükünç 1 la6) by *tömgös* *učün*; cf. Laut 1986: 49 n.2.
590 Gabain (1974: 135 and elsewhere) thought that the accusative in these phrases came from the fact that so many of the postpositions originally were converbs (as e.g. the last one mentioned). Another explanation would be that the form was in fact an oblique stem, as found also in a part of the pronouns before some case suffixes. On the
appears to follow the same structure although the second syllable of ‘two’ is not the possessive suffix synchronically; see UW 171-3 for examples. yüzün utru in M III nr. 8 VII v9 is an exception, as one would expect *yüzin. Doerfer 1992 takes this single exception (which stands beside a huge number of cases where the suffix is a normal accusative), the phrase äkin / ikin ara, the form sizintäg ‘like you’ in ChrManMsFr ManFr r 10\(^5\) and plural personal pronouns which have an intercalary +Xn+ in oblique cases as indicating that there was an oblique stem beside an accusative. This is possible but not certain.

In Uygur it often happens that nominals with 2\(^{nd}\) or 3\(^{rd}\) person possessive suffix are in the nominative and not the accusative form when governed by postpositions, but in Manichaean texts these instances are a tiny minority: kälän käyik muyuz täg ‘like the unicorn’s horn’ (T I 105); tôpösi üzä ‘with his head’ (U II), tängrä elig kuš birlä (HTs VIII 25) ‘with his divine majesty the king’, bo montag üküš ädgülnäni kapügü äčün (HTs VIII 46) ‘because it is the gate to this much good’, oglä äčün (KP 8,5) ‘for his son’, yiğnäci tîzüg täg (TT X 450) ‘like a row of pearls’. tašığ özi üzä tutsar ‘if one keeps the stone on oneself’ even appears in a runiform ms., Blatt 17. In E32 I Vasil’ev’s text can be read as ār ärdämi äčün (as done by Doerfer 1992:99) and this is also what Thomsen and Wulff have.\(^5\) The Manichaean ms. M III nr. 15 has two instances of this type: yarlïkamïšä ecün ‘because he ordained’ in r 2 and eligimiz kuš üzä ‘over his majesty our king’ in v 23;\(^3\) the phrases buyan tüşi üzä and tiliñiz üzä appear in a late Manichaean text, in Pothi 376 and Pothi 108 respectively, ätözü tägrä ‘concerning your body’ appears in TT I 219, a late text.\(^4\) In Suv 18,21 tägrä appears to govern the nominative of a pronoun: ol nom ärdini bo tägrä adin yertä yok ‘That valuable book is not found anywhere else around here’.

Nouns with 1\(^{st}\) person possessive suffixes do not have the accusative suffix; e.g. olortokum üčün (BQ E 36) ‘as I reigned’, yavaşäm birlä (M II 8,16) ‘with my gentle one’, öz kazgançüm üzä (KP 12,2) ‘with my own earnings’ or yüzümüz utru (TT II,1 6) ‘before our face’.

\(^5\) This form presumably came about because täg was in the process of becoming a case suffix since the Orkhon inscriptions; cf. antäg, montag, bintägi etc.

\(^5\) Kormuš in 1997: 115 (l.5) was unable to see this.

\(^5\) In both cases the possessive suffix is spelled with two yods, but this is a text in Manichaean writing, where alef and yod are not at all similar.

\(^5\) Küvrügünü täg (TT VIII G70) does not have an aberrant accusative of the possessive suffix but should be read as küvrüg üni täg ‘like the sound of a drum’.
When a genitive of any nominal gets nominalised, it stays in the genitive form when getting governed by a postposition, e.g.:

\[ \text{agïr ayïg kïlïn\(\text{\_\_\_}\) olarnï ðïm olarnï} \]

(Suv 139,13) `May my grave sins get purified and annihilated like theirs (i.e. the bodhisattvas'). This is not to be confused with the genitive replacing the accusative of pronominal forms without semantic justification.

Few postpositions govern the accusative of nouns. Gabain 1974 § 278 lists \text{kïcã} `(in) crossing', which governs the names of rivers in the accusative in KT and BQ, among the postpositions; there is no reason to take this converb to be petrified, however, and its use and meaning in no way differs from what a converb of \text{kïc\_} should have. \text{tuta} `concerning' does, however, appear to differ in meaning from what would be a converb of \text{tut\_} `to hold' and may therefore have become a postposition:

\[ \text{munda kïlïgïtï tïsta sïzlêmï ol, kïrïszïgï tïsta ârmïz} \] (Abhi A 30a7) `This has here been said concerning the polluted, not concerning the pure'; \text{nïcã aðïn oronta yarïtkïsïr ymï \ldots\ yawnikïlgï tïnlïgïlrigï tïsta ãïrï; bo yïrïlgïgï tïsta ârmïz} (Abhi B 98b7) `Even if one preaches elsewhere, this is (done) with respect to converted creatures, not with respect to the present interpretation'. Abhi being a very late text, the emergence of a postposition governing the accusative may be a late development.

\text{tïgi} `till, all the way to' governs the dative; it is often spelled together with the word preceding it, as in \text{tïnri yerïnïtïgi} `all the way to the land of the gods'. It does not necessarily imply physical movement:

\[ \text{siçïrï tamïrï sïnïkïnï tïgi kïzïnïp ãrtïnï lurïk bolup \ldots\ \text{his muscles and veins were visible right down to his bones and (he) had become exceedingly lean (U III 35,20). ogïsïtï `similar to', a petrified converb derived from ogïs\_} `to resemble' which is common in Buddhist texts, could also be a postposition: In \text{tïnridïm yanaï[\ldots\]g tumïskïgï ãgsïtï \ldots\ sïvïlgï kïrïtï \text{\_\_\_} iki kïlïn bïk tutup} (U III 24,9) `holding fast his two \ldots\ lovely and beautiful arms, which resemble the trunk of the divine elephant', e.g., it would be a synonym of \text{tïg} or \text{osoglug}, \text{yara\_}, e.g. \text{igïnï yara\_}i nom ïrontïg} (MaitH Y 268) `a religious medicine suitable to their illness' or \text{kïnïlïkï yara\_}i \text{oron} (BT VII A361) `a place suitable for the soul', can also be considered a postposition. Similarly \text{tïgïmïlgï} `worthy of', which also governs the dative: Its first part is a semantically not very transparent -(X)m derivate from \text{tïg\_} `to reach'. \text{eyïn} governs the dative beside the nominative; examples are given above.

\text{utru} governs the nominative beside being commonly used as an adverb. In \text{elig bïgïkï utru yorïyu kïltï} (U III 63,6-7) `He came walking
towards the king’ it may be governing the dative; elig bägä is less likely to have been governed by käl-.

The local and temporal postpositions üzä ‘over; by’, ögrä ‘before’ and içrä ‘in, into’ can govern both the nominative and the locative: e.g. in muntada ögrä ‘before this’ (U IV A 263) and ävi on kän ögrä ürküp barmïš ‘Their households are said to have fled ten days earlier’. kişi oglïnda üzä (Orkhon Turkic); barçada üzäräk (BT V 171, with the comparative suffix) ‘higher than everything (else)’ and on uygur ... üzä ... olorup ‘ruling over the O.U. ...’. The phrase suv içrä appears both in M I 17,14 and 35,17 but signifies ‘in’ in the first and ‘into’ in the second passage: balak suv içrä yiezärä ‘as (a) fish swim(s) in the water’ vs. kuyk[a]sin ... suv içrä kümïmïślär ‘they threw its skin into the water’. In iki yarok ordo içrä olorugma ‘residing in the two palaces of light’ (Xw 52) it is the former, in saqir içrä alik keyk kîrmïš (IrqB 63) ‘aroe deer entered the ring of beaters’ the latter. Then we have içrä governing the locative, in anta içrä (M III nr.4 v16) ‘inside that’. asra, another +rA form, is not attested with the locative; with the nominative we have it in what appears to be a lexicalised phrase: We have adak asra kîl- ‘to subdue’ and adak asra bol- ‘to be subdued’ (see both in UW 235a, § B of the entry for asra). See section 4.1107 for other syntactic functions of +rA forms. Some +dXn forms govern either the locative, e.g. kuvragta taš tïn ‘outside the congregation’ (HTs III 802), iki yašda altïn ‘under two years of age’ (U I 10, Magier), käyrädın öyldün ‘east of Käyrä’, or the nominative: säläk ïgä kedin ‘west of the Selenga (river)’ (inscriptional), balïk taš tïn ‘outside the town’ (KP 1,2), ögni sögï altïn (Udayana 30 in SIAL 18(2003): 157) ‘under different trees’.

stašra and taš tïn, both ‘outside’, kesrä and basa, both ‘after’, and körö ‘compared to, with respect to’ are attested with the locative case: kop äkgïddä içrä, kamag ayïgä tašra ärzïnë (MaiTH Y 33) ‘May they partake of all good and be free of all evil’; bir braman [ol] kuvragta taš tïn turup ... (HTs III 801) ‘a brahman was standing outside (that) company and ...’ kesrä appears not to have been used outside the runiform inscriptions, e.g. anta kesrä in Tuñ 6, KT, ŠU N 10-12, and (rarely) the Manichæan sources, e.g. antada kesrä ‘after that’ in Xw 138. basa, which became a postposition only in Uygur, appears in the very common phrase anta ~ antada basa ‘thereupon’ and in muntada basa

The locative case is used for motion towards a goal beside denoting lack of movement when this motion results in the moving object staying in its destination; similarly, the use of içrä with movement may have been licensed when the result was a static situation
‘hereupon’ (BT II 154 and 914, once in Suv) or montag tep yarlıkamışda basa (Suv 463,11) ‘after having preached with these words’ olar bursan kutün bulup ārtmištä basa anta ken (BT II 1330) ‘after they will have reached Budhahood, afterwards, ...’. körö appears in proverbs: altun sarığıta körö eşič karası yeg; yürügü596 kümişdä körö ayak toloş yeg (HamTouHou 16,13-14) ‘Better than yellow gold is that the pot should be black; better than white silver is that the bowl should be full’ and ašidištä körö körmiš yeg (ThS III a3) ‘To have seen (something) is better than to have heard (about it)’; it is also attested in the DLT. The (petrified converb and) adverb ašnu ‘previous(ly)’ also governs the locative when used as postposition, e.g. ıkış azunta ašnu (Aranemi 1 a r13) ‘many existences earlier’; further examples of this are mentioned in UW 243b under ašnu § C).

Normally, postpositions which govern the locative in ablative or separative meaning are also (at least occasionally) attested with the ablative. The reason that this does not happen with the three postpositions mentioned last is that kesrä appears only in texts where the ablative is exceedingly rare, őgrä is normally an adverb and is hardly ever attested as postposition and basa (beside its adverbial functions) normally appears with the pronouns anta or munta.

One of the postpositions governing both the locative and the ablative is adïn ‘other than’, which is documented in its ablatival function in UW 50a (lower half) for Uygur. It is often used together with őği ‘distinct, different from; except’, e.g. in muntada adïn takï őği aš ięğü yok (Suv 610,16) ‘There is no other or different food than this’. For őği cf. further künṭä ayda őği (Xw 64) ‘other than sun and moon’; isig ožlärîntä őği ɨdürdüm ‘I separated them from their lives’ and nomta őği ‘except by the doctrine’. The ablative itself can also get governed by őği, e.g. in isig ožlärîntin őği adîrtüm (Suv 135,17).597 With these instances we should raise the question as to whether őği is not phraseologically related to the verb in such a way that the +dl forms are not governed by őği by itself but rather by the verb phrases őği ɨdür- and őği adîr-; the answer is probably negative. őği governs numerals (discussed in section 3.14) in the nominative. oţgûrî ‘because of’ has the same government pattern (except the feature of őği

596 Spelled as YWRWK, as a spelling characteristic; not very likely to have been pronounced as yürüg although the loss of the pronominal n in sarıg+i+t+a (spelled SRXYT) does make that a possibility.
597 The phrase in antîn őği yolkä in (U I 9,7) could perhaps also be read as adîn őği, a common binome to be read also on l.14 of the same page in reference to the same circumstances, also with T for /dl/ under voice confusion.
mentioned last): övkälärintä ötgürü (U IV A 34) ‘because of their anger’ or nägüdü ötgürü (U II 5,14) ‘for what reasons?’. With the ablative: kértgünčinčin ötgürü (Pothi 374) ‘because of their faith’; bo ùçgünčiň kavışmakändin ötgürü (Suv 52,19) ‘because of the conjunction of these three’, küčläg täriň kertgünc köäßürändin ötgürü ‘because of their strong and deep faith’ (ShÖAv 112).

Most postpositions which (at least in part determined by dialect and historical development) can govern either the locative or the ablative have temporal meaning: Of bärü ‘since; from ... on’ we have the locative in antada bärü, antadata bärü and ančada bärü ‘since then’ or e.g. in äkidä äidä bärü (M I 11,17-18) but the ablative in bolmişdän bärü (ms. U 130a v6, in Wilkens 2000: 444); -mländ bärü is attested very well; cf. section 4.633. The sentence bašτïn bärü atakka tägi ökitüm (thus instead of adakka and ökidüm) ‘I have read it from beginning to end’ is a very late reader’s addition to a Manichaean text in M I 30,24.

òtrö ‘after, following’ mostly governs the locative: uktöka ötrö ‘after having understood’ (MaitH XV 5v21) or anda ötrö ‘thereupon’ (Tuń 16); nädä ötrö (M III nr.6 II v 13) signifies ‘why?’. It is also attested with the ablative, however, in beş törlüg savdan ötrö ‘as a result of five types of things’ (M III nr.8 V r7-8). We have found ablativeal instances even for ken ‘after’, which is practically always (and very often) attested with the locative: There is andän ken ‘thereupon’ in TT VII 28,47, tündmaktïn ken tugda wï nomlarïg ‘after restraining the principles which will emerge’ in Abhi 3597 and 3598. Examples with the locative are mintä ken (M I 29,16; 30,17) ‘after me’, anta ken (TT II,1 30 and elsewhere) ‘thereafter’, tör[t] burxanlarta ken (Pothi 66) ‘after the four prophets’ or yigïlmïša ken (MaitH XX 1r10) ‘after having assembled’. ïnaru is attested with the locative e.g. in muntada ïnaru ‘from now on’ (M III nr.9 II r9), bo kündä ïnaru ‘from this day on’ (U III 65,2-3 and a number of times elsewhere) but with the ablative in sâkizïnc orontïn ïnaru burxan kutïn bulgïncaka tägi (Suv 237,18) ‘from the eighth position on till one reaches buddhahood’.

The only local postposition which is used both with the locative and the ablative forms (with no apparent semantic difference between the two) appears to be kudï ‘down (from)’. We have it with the locative in kök täprüdä kudi (M III nr.15 r10) ‘down from the blue sky’ but with the ablative in kaňñdan kudi (M III nr.8 VIII v6-7) ‘down from heavens’, üstüntän kudi (M III nr.8 v10) ‘down from above’ and oronlukdïn kudi ‘down from the throne’ (KP 61,5-6). Above we quoted examples for kudi from the runiform inscriptions, where it governs the nominative.
ulatï ‘others in addition to; etc.; including’ governs the locative or the nominative. The head for postpositional phrases formed with this element is the name of a set; what it governs are one or more members of this set. When the governed phrase(s) is / are in the locative, they are members of the phrase as it is conceived but not as it is named; here an example to clarify what I mean: *bir kiši ölıüt ölärmäktä ulatï toku üz karmaputlarïg ... ärtsär* (text quoted in the n. to TT IV A 11) ‘If a person commits murder and the other nine sins’; if the phrase had been in the nominative we would have found the number ten and not the number nine, as the first one would have been presented as being included in the referent of the head: In Buddhism there are ten sins. Cf. further *tılkü böritä ulatï yavïz tïnlïglar butarlayu tartïp ...* (U III 79,1) ‘fox, wolf and other evil creatures tear it to shreds’. *üztä bazta ulatï ikiš tälîm nizvanïlar* (Pohti 33) ‘hate and the other numerous passions’ and *azta ulatï nizvanï* (TT IX 22) ‘greed and the other passions’ are Manichæan examples for this construction. *ulatï* can also govern the nominative, e.g. in *az ulatï nizvanïlïg ayïglar* (U III 88,4) ‘lust and the other evils of passion’. This is practically identical in content to the last example mentioned with a locative, but there is a difference: In runiform *aṭï öç apa totok ulatï kamïg atïlïg yüzlüg otuz är* ‘thirty (of us), all men of renown, the (ruler’s) nephew Ö. A. totok and the others’ (4th Stein ms., l.6), the overall number of men was 30, the head referring to the whole group including the set member(s) mentioned. Other such examples are *bars iripï börï ulatï yavläk tïnlïglar alku tâzïrlar* (TT VI 116) ‘Evil creatures such as tiger, panther and wolf will all flee’, *bušï ulatï alï paramït* (Aranemi 1 a r 5) ‘the six virtues including almsgiving’ or *ıtrö yay kiš ulatï tört üd adrlur* (TT VI 324 Var.) ‘Then the four seasons including summer and winter separate’; one could also write ‘the four seasons, i.e. summer, winter etc.’. Functionally, *ulatï* is a marker serving the configuration of noun phrases (cf. section 4.12).

*sï¤*:¥$¦’side’ signifies ‘in the direction of’ when it serves as postposition. It appears to govern the directional +dXn form or, less likely, the ablative. We find it throughout Old Turkic: *beridin sï¤* ‘in the south’ ŠU E 3 (runiform inscription) and BT V 193, *künbatsïkdïn sï¤* (BT V 195); *küntugsukdan sï¤* (BT V 195); *kün ortod(u)n sï¤*; *irdïn sï¤*; *yird(i)n sïjakï yel*; *kün ortodun sï¤*; *birgarudun*

---

598 See Moerlose 1986 for a good account of the meanings and functions of *ulatï*.
599 *sï¤* is used in BQ E 2 in a sentence where the EDPT translates it as ‘wing (of an army)’. It can later refer to ‘one of a pair’, and also signify ‘half’. This and the uses as postposition can be considered to belong to the same lexeme. In South Siberian Turkic *sï¤* went through a process of grammaticalization and became a case suffix.
CHAPTER FOUR

siğar ‘from the west; to the east; from the south; to the north; the northern wind; to the south; in the south’ M III 9.4-0.15 (Manichaean), koptin siğar ‘in all directions’ Pothi 60 and U III 29.2; kavutin siğar ... antin siğar U II 29.19-21 (Buddhist), ontun siğar ‘in ten directions’ in HTs VI 1528 etc. We also find it with ići+tihn (TT VII and X) and taš+dîn (TT IX 90 and TT X), iki+dîn, tört+tihn, tokuz (thus) and on+tîn.

It governs the locative form in kûn ortodâ siğar (M III 10.8) and the nominative in on siyârke burxanlar (TT VIII). yiğak ‘point of the compass, direction’ also serves as postposition governing this same form; examples for both the nominal and postpositional use are mentioned in section 4.2; the EDPT quotes examples for the expressions öntîn, tagtîn and kedin yiğak, signifying ‘eastwards’, ‘northwards’ and ‘westwards’ respectively. In tâhri burxanmîn öntun yiğak turch ‘he stood ... on the right hand side of the divine Buddha’ (TT X 158 as completed by Zieme in his ‘Nachlese’) we see that yiğak does not get a possessive suffix even if the phrase is qualified by a genitive.

tângîl ‘as much as’ (= Turkish kadar with nominative) governs the equative of measure; the most common instances are pronominal: nâcâ tângîl ‘how much’ (U III 73.2, TT X 345, several times in Su v etc.), munça tângîl ‘this much’ (Suv 419,7) and încâ tângîl (Suv 351,16) and ançe tângîl (Suv 155,22, 176,6) ‘that much’. Further, bir padakêcî tângîl nom ‘as (little as) a single verse from the doctrine’ (U III 29.16).

Postpositions can have abstract (e.g. üçün, tâg, osoglug) or concrete (e.g. kudi, tapa ‘towards’) meanings. Postpositions in abstract use are found to govern not only noun phrases but also clauses (causal and final clauses üçün, comparative clauses tâg and osoglug). When governing just nominals and not clauses, üçün usually signifies ‘for’; not, however, in the Xw: azu muñ üçün, azu busi bergâli kizganîp yetî türîlî bušî nomka tükîti berî amidimizî ârsrî (Xw 168) ‘if we were unable to fully give seven types of alms to religion whether because of distress (muñ üçün) or because we were too stingy to give’; üzä on kat kök asra sâkîz kat yer beş tâhri üçün turur (Xw 77) ‘The ten levels of heavens and the eight levels of earth subsist thanks to / through the Fivefold God’.

tâg is practically synonymous with some of the uses of +êA: In TT VI 336-9 we find kişi ûtözin bulûglî antag ol kaltî tîrjang üzäki tuptak tâg; üç yavarak yolka tüsügli ança ol kaltî bo yertäki tuptrakca; ... kertgûnc könlûlîg tînlîglar ança ol kaltî tîrjang üzäki tuptrakca ‘Those who

600 m[a]paj tângîl kâsî cannot be reconstructed in TT X 499 as tângîl does not govern the dative.
acquire a human body are e.g. like (täg) soil on one’s nail; those who fall into the three evil ways are e.g. like (+čA) the soil in this earth; ... creatures with faith are e.g. like (+čA) soil on one’s nail ...

Some postpositions, like üzä or tägrä, have both concrete and abstract meaning: tägrä means either ‘around’ or ‘concerning’ (like English ‘about’); üzä can signify ‘over, on’ (as in the sentence just quoted or some quoted above) but also governs noun phrases referring to instruments or aspects of activities or states (e.g. öz kazgančim üzä ädgü kilmé kilayin ‘I would like to do good deeds by my own merit’ in KP 12,3 or ün ägzig üzä yegadmiš ‘excellent through his voice’ in BT II 511) and (in Uygur) to the agent in the passive (see OTWF 692-693).

sayu ‘all’ appears only in local expressions but deletes the case suffix of the noun phrase it governs; this is explained by etymology, the form presumably coming from the vowel converb of sa- ‘to count’: In kay sayu bodun sayu ‘to every street and every tribe’ or (HTs VIII 69) buluy yiŋak sayu yaddilar ‘they spread (the teachings) to the corners of the globe’ the implicit case suffix is the dative; in kalmış süngük yer sayu (Suv 626,16-17) ‘the bones remain everywhere’ or üküš ärüš bodun sayu (Wettkampf 58) ‘among very much of the public’, the implied case is the locative: The verb governing the postpositional phrase disambiguates these contents.

There are two or perhaps three converb markers consisting of converb + postposition: There is -A birlä, which is a well attested analytical temporal converb suffix (cf. section 4.633; -A does not have specifically temporal content by itself), and we find a few instances of a sequence -gAll üčün, where the meaning of the converb suffix and the postposition are in mutual support (cf. section 4.636). In the first case, birlä probably was an adverb also signifying ‘at once’, which did not govern the vowel converb; in -gAll üčün, üčün disambiguates, as -gAll can also signify ‘since’. turginčara in Höllen 21, 72 and 78 is likely to be contracted from turginča ara and to signify ‘as long as they stay (in that hell)’; cf. turginča için ara biliš- ‘to be acquainted with each other’. Here the postposition would again be strengthening the meaning already found in the converb form. In Abhi 1398-99 there is a similar construction (but with ekiŋ between the two words).

täg can govern finite verb forms; e.g. munuŋ tǔšamiš tǔllærin koduru kololasar män otgaratı ordog karšığ kodup tašgaru üngäy täg män (MaitH XIII 4v7) ‘If I deeply meditate on the dreams she dreamt, it looks as if I would definitely abandon the palace and go out’, where I have translated the postposition as ‘it looks as if’. See section 3.27 for epistemic content and historical connections of this verb phrase.
4.22. Relational noun constructions

Relational nouns are a set of nouns linked to the nominal they govern through an izafet construction, i.e. what I have dealt with as ‘nominal phrase with possessive satellite’ in section 4.121. Within such phrases relational nouns serve as head with possessive suffix; typically, they are in the locative case. In earlier Uygur, nouns governed within such constructions are in the nominative and not in the genitive case, as would have been equally possible if these were normal izafet constructions; governed pronouns, on the other hand, are in the genitive case. With nouns with possessive suffixes we appear to have both possibilities. Governed nominals can also be replaced with zero reference to the context, i.e. disappear; the stable mark of the construction is the possessive suffix added to the relational noun. A number of elements are both postpositions and relational nouns; they will be dealt with further on. Nouns which also serve as postpositions but do not appear in the izafet type of structure are here not classified as relational nouns; this is the case with yığak ‘direction’, which governs nouns in the +dXn form and does not need the possessive suffix to do so. We first give a list of relational nouns, with a few examples:

The concrete relational nouns denote relative placing or timing, used in the locative case form. Such are iç ‘the inside’ (e.g. öv bärk içim ‘in a house’ TT II,1 42), taştin ‘the outside’ (e.g. sugčen taştıninta ManBuchFr p.148,5 ‘outside Su-chên’), ön ‘front; face’ (e.g. sizīq önünîzdə ‘before you’ M III 24,4 nr.9 II), orto ‘middle’ and üsk ‘presence’ (e.g. maytri tārī buxmin üskim ‘in the presence of the divine Buddha Maitreya’ TT IV B48 or mənîq üskim ‘in my presence’ TT X 203); also others, which we mention below as they are also used as postpositions. ön ‘face’ and baş ‘head’ (başinta e.g. in HTs III 389) are examples for the use of names for body parts as relational nouns. asra ‘below’ appears to be used once, in a late text, as relational noun, in asrasinta agnalim (USp 177,8) ‘let us write the below him’; otherwise it is an adverb (used as a postposition in the phrase adak asra ‘subdued, subjected’). azusınta ‘beside, on the side of’ (documented in the UW entry for it) also has the shape of a relational noun; a noun azu is attested as azu+ki and azu+ča (both listed in the UW) and with the meaning ‘from the side’ in azuþın tur- (MaitH Y 376).

---

601 The conjunction azu ‘or’ does not have quite the same meaning but a semantic bridge would be possible.
Then there are relational nouns in abstract use, as *yol+în+ta* ‘concerning’: *bo borluk yolînta* ... *akam inîm yeğânim tagayîm* ... *çam çarîm kîlmaçunlar* (Sa11,13 in SammlUigKontr 2) ‘May my brothers, nephews or uncles ... not raise any objections concerning this vineyard’. Similar instances of *yolînta* appear in other contracts, in Sa16,12, 22,8 and 23,15, WP6,2, 4, 6, 7 and 31, Mi3,12 and Mi27,4. *bilir biz temiš yolînta* (WP 6,31) is ‘concerning it having been said “We are responsible”’.

All other relational nouns in abstract use express different views on causality; e.g. *ugur* ‘time, simultaneity, sake’ which governs the object of the agent’s motive in *az niţvanî ugrînta* ‘for the sake of lust’ (TT II,2 20) or *ogul ugrînta* ‘for the sake of a son’ (MaitH XI 3v16). Sometimes, e.g. *[samtsao] açarî ugrînta* in HTs III 463, *ugrînta* signifies ‘concerning’. *ugrîña* with dative, not locative, has still a different meaning: *samtsa açarî tîrkin teğîn swô yaratiš ugrîña sàviņê öttig ûdü* (HTs VII 216) ‘On the occasion of the crown prince having written a preface, the master tripîta sent a letter of thanks’. Further *tîltag* ‘cause’, *tîlhaînta* signifying ‘because of’ (e.g. in HTs VIII 4-5), and *kûc* ‘force’, *kûcînta* signifying ‘due to’, thus in *âdgu kîlîn kûcînta* (TT IX 96 and 102) ‘thanks to good deeds’ or *ûntûs nomnuû kûcînta* (ET$ 17,11) ‘due to the *dharma* of ascent’. *tûş* signifies ‘fruit’ but more often ‘consequence’; *tûşînta* ‘as a result of’ appears to function as relational noun a number of times in Pothi.

How do we distinguish between relational nouns and ordinary nouns appearing in nominal phrases, as would be *kişiniţîn avînta* ‘in the man’s house’ or even in *kûmân irînta* ‘north of the Sayan (range)’? The simplest case, when a noun is attested only in the relational noun construction, is quite rare: *îsk* appears to be an example for this. In general, the border is fuzzy and there will certainly be cases where scholars might disagree. The main criteria are meaning and distribution: *kûc* ‘force, power’, e.g., does not have the same meaning and is not attested in the same contexts as *kûcînta*, which expresses causality. Then there is the principle of the content of relational nouns being more general: ‘inside’, ‘outside’, ‘before’ etc. a re more general than ‘north’, not to speak of ‘house’. Any object has an ‘inside’ (and in fact many non-objects as well), but being in the ‘north’ is not a relevant information for many entities, and only persons can have a ‘house’. Relational nouns express basic spatial or logical concepts and this fact reflects on their distribution and use. We do not wish to exclude the possibility that a relational noun can also be a ‘normal’ noun, as clearly happens with names for body parts or, in another way, the highly versatile lexeme *ara*: As Röhrborn points out in UW 170b,
ara is used as a noun in the phrase iki kaš arasînî tuşi ‘the place between the two eyebrows’ in UigTot 668 and 679. That (quite late!) text (832) also has arasî appearing in the dative in iki kaš kavişîg arasîna tâgip ‘reaching the place between the two eyebrows’ and in the ablative in altmîşar kolki lenxwanîg arasîntîn savlar kudulup (ETS 20,137) ‘water pours from among 60 myriad lotuses’. In the vast majority of Old Turkic instances I have noticed, relational nouns appear in the locative.

Several postpositions are used as relational nouns as well, e.g. both üzä+sin+tâ and tâgrä+sin+dâ in Höllen 35: üzâsînâ [ya]linlayu turur yogan tuluklar tâgrâsînâ tokip anîg içîndâ batururlar ‘They knock around him with the thick cudgels602 which keep flaming above him and they submerge him in it (i.e. in the ground with red-hot irons)’. We have explicit nominal government in tâprü bûrûxan tâgrâsîntî (TT X 349) ‘around the divine Buddha’. The postposition basa appears as relational noun e.g. in elig bûg basasînda yoriyu (U IV A141-2) ‘walking after the king’ or tâprü bûrûxan basaînda (TT X 142-3) ‘after the divine buddha’ and the postposition utru ‘opposite, facing’ also in utruyda ... kâldî ‘came to meet you’ (TT I 113). The meaning of the adverb udu is close to that of basa; we find it used as relational noun in mini ymä sîziy udnûyszta etût bûrzun (U III 49,28) ‘Let him take me along following you.’ kenîndâ is often used adverbially to signify ‘thereafter, in the end’. Numerous examples of arasînî governing nouns (mostly in the nominative, rarely, e.g. in Suv 492,5, in the genitive) are quoted or mentioned in UW 172-173; one example is kîncîn atûg bûgînî kîsîsi ... igláp ... ögsîz Yadî: ögsîzi arasînî laylag sîzláp ... (Suv 17,22) ‘The wife of a gentleman called Xiancheng was ill ... and lay unconscious. Between her unconscious phases she spoke incoherently ...’. The use of ara as relational noun is likely to be secondary: This use is not found at all in such an extensive early Buddhist text as the Mait, and not in inscriptional or Manichæan sources except perhaps in the late Pothi book as arasînîta (255).

Occasionally there is contamination between postpositions and relational nouns, as in beş törlüg ûnîfîlrunîn ûî ôzîlîrîn içîntî (BT V 221-2) ‘within the bodies of the five classes of creatures’, where ûî ôzîlîrîn is in the accusative and not in the genitive or the nominative.

602 This is a mere conjecture; I take this to be a derivate from tul- ‘to strike’ from which another derivate, tulum ‘weapon’, is well attested in Qarakhanid Turkic (discussed in OTWF 293).
4.23. Supine constructions

Among the actionality and ability auxiliaries discussed in section 3.251 and 3.253, är-, tur-, u-, bol- and kal- can govern the -gAll form. In this function (though not in the temporal function discussed in section 4.633) can be called ‘supine’ as its uses correspond to those of the Latin supine I (salutatum venire ‘to come to greet’) and II (horribile dictu ‘terrible to say’); this will be seen below. -gAll tur- signifies ‘to be about to (do something)’, which appears to have been the meaning of -gAll är- as well; -gAll kal- is ‘to be about to do the action but not to have done it as yet’. -gAll u- and -gAll bol- express ability and possibility respectively; these uses also have a lot to do with a future projection. In general, -gAll sequences express future orientation, as in -gAll ugra- ‘to intend to do’, while sequences with the other two converbs, e.g. -U alk- and -(X)p alk- ‘to finish doing’. -(X)p kod- and -U tükät- ‘to do something exhaustively’, describe how the subjects carry out their ongoing action. katïglan- (see next paragraph) and tur- are found with both the vowel and the -gAll verb, in the first case referring to ongoing, in the second to projected action.

The pragmatic verbs yarlïka- and ötün- (discussed in section 5.3) are, in these functions used only with the vowel converb: -U yarlïka- is ‘to deign to do, to graciously do’, -gAll yarlïka-, on the other hand, ‘to order somebody to do’; -U ötün- ‘to say respectfully’, -gAll ötün-, on the other hand, ‘to beg somebody to do’. Examples for -gAll ay- ‘to tell to do’ are given in UW 287b, §1d in the entry for ay-. Note that, in all these cases where a -gAll form is followed by a verb of utterance, the two verbs have different subjects; thus e.g. in şarîrîg sûükïngï yahöklärig tämgrürlärig agîr ayag tapïg udug kîlglî nágülük yarlïkadî (Suv B17.1r8) ‘Why did he order people and gods to honour and revere his relic bones?’ Strangely enough, -U ötün- is used also when ötün- is used in its lexical meaning ‘to beg’ and not as pragmatic auxiliary in those cases in which the first verb and ötün- have the same subject; e.g. yazokda boşuna ötünür biz (Xw 101) is ‘We beg to get free of sin’. The vowel converb is here used as supine. This may be a Manichaean (or early) characteristic, however, as the use of -gAll ötün- does not necessarily imply different subjects for the two verbs: We have bargalî ötün- ‘to beg to go’ in HTs VII 1883, a Buddhist text no doubt later than the Xw”astvänîft.

We now come to the supine constructions in the narrower sense. The -gAll form is, in Uygur, often the complement of verbs of attitude, intention and expression, in which cases the two verbs always have the same subject: kâlgâli tapla- (TT X 113) ‘to be glad to come’, bargalî
tapla- (TT X 275) ‘to be glad to go’, -gAlI köngül örit- ‘to set one’s mind on doing’ (very common), tıŋkagalı unama- (DKPAMPb 1177) ‘not to agree to listen’, sanıŋgalı kilin- (TT X 359) ‘to set about to stab’, körkitgali kilin- ‘to set about to show’, virxar etgali baštla- ‘to start to build a monastery’, yarmangali sakın- ‘to plan to climb’, üzgali katıglan- is ‘to exert oneself to break’, ukgalı kataglan- (MaitH XV 5r30) ‘to strive to understand’ while tıdu katıglan- with vowel converb signifies ‘to work hard at hindering’: In the first case the breaking or the understanding has not yet taken place; in the second, the hindering is going on. tur- ‘to stand (up); to arise’ denotes the expectation of an event when governing the supine (e.g. ölgali tur- ‘to be about to die’); with -(X)p or the vowel converb it expresses continuing or repeated action (section 3.251). We have -gAlI küsä- ‘to wish to do’ e.g. in HTs III 925, -gAlI ugra- ‘to intend to do’, e.g. in birök ... nā nāgū iš iš lağaš ładịgali ugrasar ol ugrurda ... tep sözlüyür arđi (U III 54,15) ‘Whenever she intended to commit something, she used to say “...”’; tınlıgalıg ölür gali ugradı (TT X 35) ‘he intended to kill living beings’. Further examples of this type of phrase are quoted or mentioned in EDPT 91b. There are no final clauses here (as is often the case with -gAlI forms discussed in section 4.636), because the two verbs cannot be said to constitute two separate clauses and because we saw that the meaning is by no means always final.

In birök yargali korksar (Heilk II nr.3 1.4) ‘If one is afraid to break it (a wound?) open, however, ...’ and buštı bergali kığanıp (Xw 168) ‘to be (too) stingy to give alms’ the meaning is most clearly not final, as the second verb of the phrase does not lead to the realization of the first (and is certainly not temporal); it can most clearly be characterised as supine. There is a similar instance in HTs X 499-504: samtso ačarı pavandin éénıp pavan kedinki suv ogün[tā] kāćgali adaki tayipc sürçüp yotası ançaįya kıršǔdi ‘Master Xuanzang got out from the cell (but) was prevented from crossing the rivulet behind it when his foot slipped and the skin of his shin was scraped a bit’. In these three instances the main verb states what prevents or prevented the subject from carrying out the activity denoted by the supine; cf. English ‘be afraid to go’ and ‘be prevented from going’.

In kümçųylarka yarangali sakınčın ‘with the intention of currying favour with women’ (U III 75,10) the -gAlI form also has supine function: The expression comes from the phrase -gAll sakın- attested e.g. in MaitH XI 14r28.

The Old Turkic supine can qualify adjectives, as can its Latin counterpart; e.g.: tupulgalı učuz ‘easy to pierce’ and üzgali učuz ‘easy to break’ in Tuň I S6 show that this function existed already in Orkhon.
Turkic, while bürgâli yumşak (TT X 445) ‘soft to the touch’ appears in a Buddhist text. Cf. körgâli körklüg ‘beautiful to see’ in Wettkampf 36-7; a similar expression appears in another Manichaean text, in TT IX 14. Instances where a -gAlI form gets governed by tägimlig ‘worthy of’ (which otherwise governs the dative of what the head of the construction is worthy of) are of the same structure: e.g. töz töpötä tutgalî tägimlig ‘worthy of being carried on the top of one’s head’ (TT IX 16); further examples appeared in TT IX 26 (damaged), DKPAMPb 1112, MaitH X 4v9.

In the sentence yertîn čüdäki kamag uژîk bilîr baxšîlarka baxşî bolgalî sîni [bi]rlâ tângätî uژîk bilîr kişi yok (MaitH XI 16r13) the supine is again not subordinated to a verb but to tângätî ‘equal’; it signifies ‘There is no literate person able as well as you to become a teacher of all literate teachers on earth’.

### 4.3. Sentence patterns

The sections 4.31 and 4.32 deal with sentence patterns; another way to analyse sentences, namely looking at the way the speaker chose to arrange and organise what he packs into a sentence, is the topic of section 4.4.

The structure of interrogative sentences is identical to that of assertive ones. Yes / no questions are characterised by the particle mU, which is moved around in the sentence to follow the word whose applicability the speaker queries; the sentence structure thus remains unchanged by its presence. Its unmarked position is after the verb; when, however, it appears elsewhere (e.g. ’Xâgan mu kisayîn” tedîm ‘I said ”Should I make him a kaghan?” in Tuñ 5), the word it follows is focussed on. The Orkhon inscriptions have an element gU which shows that the speaker expects a negative answer; see part V for its use. ärki ‘I wonder’ can follow the particle mU in Uygur. Disjunctive yes/no questions are construed as in Azeri, with yok by itself for indicating the negative alternative: burxan kutin bulu yarlîkayok mu ol azu yok (HTsTug 3b4) ‘Has he already graciously attained Buddhahood or hasn’t he?’.

Here is a barely embedded indirect question: anî bilmädi, öfräki jâvirgüçîlår uژîkin yörügin tüklîlår mu ärki tep (HTs VII 870-2) ‘He did not know whether previous translators had rendered text and

---

603 This should be read as körgâli tugîllîg (or togîllîg), with a +lxg adjective attested also in Suv 619,22; TT IX 20 is similarly damaged, and the entry ‘uğîl’ in the EDPT is a ghost.
meaning in their completeness’. Other types of questions are asked by using interrogative-(indefinite) pronouns, discussed in section 3.134. Their presence does not change the basic sentence pattern either, although they are not always in situ and can also be attracted to the sentence onset. mU is generally not used in the same sentence as interrogative pronouns, but cf. “... sädiräksiz yigi kînîçî[Jarîğ üklîtip as[îp] sarînû umadîn nû turgay mu siz’” tep tedi (Alex 22-23) “‘Carrying out more and more deeds one after the other, will you be unable to be patient and stop at all?’” he said’; I translate nû indefinitely and adverbially, as ‘at all’.

Classified by predicate there are two basic sentence patterns: The verbal sentence (in section 4.32) has a finite verb as its predicate (i.e. comment) or as part of its predicate. The non-verbal sentence (dealt with in section 4.31) has no such verb.

4.31. Nominal sentence patterns

The most common pattern of nominal sentences is bipartite, one part representing the topic, the other one the comment; e.g. etigi [ärti] köklâ (HTs III 749) ‘Its (i.e. a monastery’s) ornamentation is very beautiful’. The copula, which is needed under certain circumstances described below, is not considered to be an essential part in any type of nominal sentence. Beside bipartite nominal sentence types, Old Turkic also has tripartite nominal sentences, which have elements such as bar ‘there is’, yok ‘there isn’t’, yeg ‘better’ or kârgâk ‘necessary’ as (part of) their predicate (comment). Certain types of exclamatory sentences have no (explicit or implicit) topic – comment structure; theirs is a single-part pattern.

The copula is a normally and fully inflecting verb (see section 3.29). Copular sentences will nevertheless be discussed in this section, as the copula represents the link between topic and comment and is needed when the predicate (or comment) is a noun (phrase) and marked members of tense / aspect / mood categories are to be expressed. In DLT fol. 198 we read that the Oguz say tâgâl (not ‘tâgül’, as ‘emended’ by the editors) instead of ârmâz for negating bipartite nominal sentences.

---

604 The translation of nâçük ol bîrlâ [toj o wan vudi atîîg xanlar?] tûpâgîy mû olar yeg atîîg âcâî? (HTs VII 128-130) should, e.g., be ‘How does he (compare) with the emperors Tang-wang and Wu-di? Will they equal in quality?’ and not as translated by the editor.

605 Both tâgül and tâgül can come from *tâg ol, one through unrounding, the other through raising; Non-first-syllable /O/ was retained only when followed by /k/.
The following passage in U I 8 (Magier) shows a few different types of what one would consider bipartite nominal sentences: \(\text{bo taš ārtijū agū turur. bo bir yumgak taš, nāgūlūk ol biziūgū?} \) ‘This stone is exceedingly heavy. This (is) one lump of stone, what do we need it for (lit. what for [is] it to us)?’ The first sentence could be defined as verbal although its ‘comment’ is a fully predicative adjective, or it could be defined as nominal considering the fact that \(\text{turur} \) has no lexical content but aspectual content at best; the other two sentences are nominal in every sense; they are tenseless (though especially the third one does refer to the time of speaking). In the first sentence there is a demonstrative as part of the topic. In the second one the topic \(\text{bo} \) ‘this’ points at the referent of \(\text{bo taš} \) ‘this stone’ of the previous sentence; in the third sentence the same topic is referred back to by \(\text{ol} \) ‘that’; \(\text{bo} \) is demonstrative, \(\text{ol} \) anaphoric. Considering \(\text{bız} \) ‘we’ of this third sentence also to be part of what is ‘given’ for both the speaker and the addressee leaves \(\text{nāgūlūk} \) ‘serving as what’ as predicate. This predicate (or rather what the addressee is asked to supply) is neither verbal nor nominal but adverbial; there is no copula in either of these sentences.

Another purely nominal bipartite sentence is \(\text{mān kololadokum kamagdū ārklig yultūz ārmiš} \) (l.5–9 in runiform ms. TM 342 = U5) ‘What I have discovered (is that the) stars turn out to be the mightiest’. \(\text{ārmiš} \) is merely the copula of the subordinated sentence, which is the predicate of the whole; there is nothing explicitly linking \(\text{mān kololadokum} \) to \(\text{kamagdū ārklig yultūz ārmiš} \). This sentence is an instance of the most common type of nominal sentences, which has the structure ‘A is B’, whatever the nature of A and B and the content of ‘is’ in any particular case. The first two sentences in the passage quoted in the previous paragraph are of this type.

If the topic is in the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) or 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) person, the personal pronoun is made to follow the predicate, presumably becoming a clitic: Nothing else could explain this position, the natural place for the topic being initial position. E.g. \(\text{ol kızlar “kapagē či biz” tep tedi ... “kapagē či kirkēn biz” tedilēr} \) (KP 41,5-42,6) ‘Those maidens said “We are doorkeepers” ... “We are doorkeeper servants” they said’. Note that there is no number concord between subject and predicate; \(\text{kapagē} \) and \(\text{kapagē ĉi kirkēn} \) are

---

\(6^0\) This fact made Peter Zieme, who recently reedited the text, think that these were two sentences, the first of which he translates as “This is what I have found:”. Since, however, there is no explicit “this is” to serve as predicate of the first sentence either, and since the second sentence is such a predicate, the two stretches have to be linked.
not in the plural. Sometimes pronominal subjects appear both in initial and in post-predicate position; e.g. *siz arok siz; aroklay* (KP 55.4-5) ‘You are tired; take a rest’ or *‘biz az biz’* teyin ‘saying ’we are few’” in the Tuñ inscription. These might, of course, also be cases of topicalization, which would make ‘As for us, we are few’ the better translation for the last-quoted example.

If the topic is unmarked for person, the sentences with both nominal and verbal predicates may end with the pronoun *ol* ‘that’. One presumable source is a topicalising structure; a sentence like *bilgä Tuñokok anig ol* should possibly be translated ‘(As for) the counsellor T., he is wicked’. In some cases, *ol* is neither topic nor comment but seems to function like a copula (as e.g. the 3rd person pronouns in Modern Hebrew); therefore, *ol* may also have been introduced at some early stage to complete the paradigm *X män / X sân / X ol*. Cases such as *kilmışlar ol* (HT’sBiogr 130) or *yaratmışlar ol* (l.132, both ‘they have made ...’) show that copular *ol* is not inflected for number even when the predicate is in the plural. In *ayaların kavişurup katıglamakläglar, üč ütöžkä tûgmäkig üzünçü tüp kilmakläglar ol* (l.154), this *ol* is shared by two nominalized verbal predicates: The sentence signifies ‘They fold their hands and exert themselves and make the attainment of *trikwa* their ultimate base’.607 *täygä bahşü ärklig ol* (U III 46,1) signifies ‘The divine teacher is mighty’; *bo nišan män Miñ Tämürnüyñ ol* (USp 1,10) ‘This mark is mine – Miñ Tämür’s’. If, however, the overall meaning was ‘As for X, it is Y’, these translations should be ‘As for the divine teacher, he is mighty’ and ‘As for this mark, it is mine, M.T.’s’ respectively.

In *küsüšüm ol ötöngülik tolp yerşiçü yarotdaçäka* (Suv 372,12) ‘It is my wish to pray to him who enlightens the whole world’ the phrase *küsüšüm ol* could be paraphrased with *küsäyür män* since it governs the small clause around the *-gUlXk* form; *ol* is clearly needed for linking the topic *küsüšüm* to its predicate. In *Kulsabadi xatunlï Vipula•andrï teginli bolar ikigü mäni ol* *(The god Indra said:) ’Princess Kulï•avatïi and prince Vipulacandra, these two, they are both mine’* (U III 27,16) *ol* serves as copula. Reference to the princess and the prince is left-dislocated (see section 4.4); *bolar ikigü* then takes up this reference and ‘mine’ is predicated on that. The second suffix in *mäni ol* is the mark of number agreement between topic and

---

607 The composite suffix *-mak+lxg* is dealt with in OTWF pp. 153-155 but not its predicative use which we find in this sentence: Here the meaning appears to be a simple present.
comment, in this case added to a noun phrase consisting of a headless genitive.

Above we quoted the sentence nägülük ol bizinə? (U I 8) ‘What do we need it for?’, literally ‘For what (is) it to us?’. This sentence is not an instance of the equational pattern we have dealt with hitherto in this section. Another common way to express ‘need’ is with the modal nominal predicate kärgäk ‘(it is) necessary’; the ‘need’ again appears in the dative case, which is an integral part of the sentence pattern: E.g. el tutçağı bâğ ârkâ sălti aslı kertgünêli üçögü tâŋ kärgäk (TT VB 106) ‘A ruling nobleman is equally in need of three things: an army, provisions and faith’. A copular verb (see section 3.29) is added if verbal categories demand it or if the sentence is to be subordinated: aŋar sözler kärgäk bolmuşuzlar ārsâr sözlərni eltğäy ārdi; mâñ kärgäk ārdın ārki. (U III 69,25) ‘If it had turned out that he needed you (pl.), he would have fetched you; apparently it was me whom he needed’; mâñə ... bor kärgäk bolup (USp 1,2 and similarly often in other economical documents) ‘I needed wine and ...’. In TT VB 52 the needer appears in the nominative: nom boşgüt boşgundaçı tüzünlär ymâ nomlug tayakîg ašaguda yegüdä kertgünêli ār kärgäk ‘When šaiksas are to enjoy the support of religion, they need (to have) the hand of faith’ (an extended metaphor, ‘support’ for ‘doctrine’, ‘eat’ for ‘enjoy’, ‘hand’ for ‘faith’). To sum up, the pattern consisting of a nominative and (normally) a dative plus, usually, the predicate kärgäk generally corresponds to an (indicative) proposition stating that the entity referred to by the dative needs the entity referred to by the nominative.

The DLT proverb söğüt sölinä, kdditı kasına ‘The willow for its sap, the birch for its bark’ consists of two nominal sentences whose predicative dative has a different sort of content, viz. that of purpose.

The ablative can also be predicative, e.g. in nom keprülmüki yânä kis[i] yalngukdin tetir (HTs VII 807) ‘The spreading of the doctrine, in turn, comes from persons’.

The predicate yeg ‘better’ is bivalent, as in the proverbs altun sarıgîta körö eşič karası yeg; yürîŋ kümüśdä körö ayak tolosî yeg (HamTouHou 16,13-14) ‘Better than yellow gold is that the pot should be black; better than white silver is that the bowl should be full’: It therefore forms tripartite nominal sentences.

We have already twice met the sentence nägülük ol bizinə? (U I 8) ‘What do we need it for?’, which shows that sentences with interrogative pronoun do not need a copula. This is so already in Orkhon Turkic elim amti kani (KT E9) ‘Where is my realm now?’
Then consider the sentence *kayu ärki beš?* (MaitH Y 143) in the following context: *asag tusu kilmakı ymä beš türlüg ogrın bolur. kayu ärki beš tep tesär, âŋ ilki ...* ‘His bringing benefit (to living beings) takes place in five ways. Which five these are?608 Firstly, ...’. *beš* ‘five’, which takes up the reference of *beš türlüg ogrur*, must be the topic while *kayu* ‘which’, left-dislocated as so often with interrogative pronouns, is comment.

Exclamatory expressions such as *nä ymä taŋ, nä ymä tav rak* ‘Oh how surprising, how fast (it is)!’ or *ançama māŋi! ançama âdgü astıg tusu! ançama âdgü ku kiv!* (MaitH XI 3v7) ‘Such bliss! Such good favour! Such good luck and blessing!’ are bipartite only in the sense that their implicit topic wholly follows from the situation in which the conversation is couched. The sentence *nä sav ärki t(ā)ştrim* (MaitH XX 1r17), which is used with the meaning ‘What matter might (this) be, my lord?’ differs from nominal interrogative sentences presented in the previous paragraph by also lacking all reference to the topic; its exclamatory nature may explain this ellipsis. Even an address like *eliğlär eliği-a ,O king of kings!* (U IV A 103) could be considered to be implicitly bipartite in the sense that it informs the addressee of the speaker’s view of him as ‘king of kings’.

Only a proper name used as vocative, e.g. *a m(a)xas(a)ri-vi-ya* ‘Oh Mahāsattva!’ (HT’s III 779), can be said to be a sentence consisting of a single member, beside of course all types of expressive exclamations: These utterances show no topic – comment structure. Vocative elements are often also interpolated into utterances, e.g. already *türk bodun* ‘the Turk (or ‘united’) nation’ in Orkhon Turkic (KT IE22). Vocative NPs are often linked to imperatives, as in *körüklär âdgü tınlaglar* ‘See, good creatures!’ in MaitH XX 13v3.

Another type of non-verbal sentence is that construed with *bar* ‘there is’ or *yok* ‘there isn’t’ as predicates. With *bar* we find e.g. *bay ymä bar, yok çığay ymä bar* (KP 6,1) ‘There are both rich and poor people’; with *yok* e.g. *mini üçün âmgântäci kim ârsär yok* (U IV C 152) ‘There is nobody whatsoever who could suffer for me’. The domain of existence can be supplied in the locative case: *azu bo savîmda i gid bar gu?* (KT S 10) ‘Or is there anything false in these my words?’ In Uygur the aorist of *bul-tuk* ‘to be found’ serves as verbal alternative to *bar* and *yok* as in the following passage: *bar mu munun köküântä

---

608 *tep tesär* ‘if one says’ has not been translated here: This is a very common strategy for asking rhetorical questions then answered by the author. See section 3.343 for *ärki.*
Possessive constructions have a tripartite structure: They comprise the possessor, the possessed and bar or yok. Possession is predicated by having bar (its absence by yok) follow the possessed entity with the possessive suffix referring to the possessor: özüm kutum bar ‘I myself enjoy divine favour’; ağrıncı yok (IrqB) ‘You have no joy’. mugar nā ārsār yazok yok (PañcÖlm 23) ‘He does not have any sins whatsoever’\(^{610}\) shows that the construction is different when reference to the possessor is not limited to the possessive suffix: The nominal referring to the possessor is in the dative case and the possessed has no possessive suffix. The same possessive dative appears already (as bodunka) in the following Orkhon Turkic instance, showing that the construction was not copied from some foreign language: nā• yerdiği xaganlıq bodunka bintägi bar ārsār nā bar•i bar ārtä•i ārmış (Tuñ 56) ‘If any independent nation were to have one like me, what trouble could it ever have?’ The first instance of bar expresses possession in a rather concrete (though not economical), the second in an abstract sense.

The well-attested expression yidî yokığa täği (e.g. TT IV B56) ‘till the disappearance (even) of its smell’ clearly comes from a nominalisation of the sentence *yid\-i yok ‘It’s smell is absent’, the second possessive suffix referring back to the entity whose complete disappearance is envisaged. Although they are grammatical predicates in that they alternate (as shown below) with forms of the copula, show possession and for other reasons, bar and yok are in fact nominals signifying ‘existing’ and ‘non-existing’ on the one hand, ‘existence’ and ‘non-existence’ on the other. The attributive and referential uses can be found in the passage yok ārmáz, azük sav sözlädim[ž], yokug bar, barag yok tep tedimiz (MaitH XX 14r3-4) ‘We have said non-existing (yok ārmáz) and mendacious (azük), have presented the non-existing as existing and the existing as non-existing;’ yok is here first used adnominally, then nominally. The binomes bay bar and yok īğay (e.g. KP 6,1) respectively signify ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. bar and yok

---

\(^{609}\) Note the ellipsis of the nominative in the second part of the disjunctive construction.

\(^{610}\) ‘whatsoever’ translates nā ārsār; see section 3.134 for this expression of generality. Cf. kim ārsār in the U IV C152 sentence in the previous paragraph.
can even be topics, as in the proverb *bar bakîr, yok altun* (DLT fol. 181) ‘What is present is (like) copper (one cares nought about it), what is absent is (precious like) gold’.

Sentences of existence are transferred away from the present by verbal means; e.g. *yana ymâ bar ärdi sikwen atlig nomći âcârî* (HTs VIII 76) ‘Moreover, there was the preacher and teacher named Qi Xuan’. Both *amtïâ tâgi taki bar ârïr* (BT I A 2 4) ‘It (i.e. a sûtra) still exists even till now’ and *inçïp amtï yertinçüdâ bo užak yok ârïr* (MaitH XI 15r20) ‘However, this character does not exist on earth at present’ show the adverb *amtï, âr-âr* was apparently joined to *bar* and to *yok* to show that the present in the narrow sense is meant.

In *âdgü kîlmî bar ârip* ... (BT II 1201) ‘(if) he has good deeds (to his favour) and ...’ and *ol âki kişi bar ârsâr* ‘since there are those two persons’ we see that *bar* needs the copula to get subordinated. Unlike in Turkish, *bar* and *yok* are not replaced by the converb of the copula in case of subordination; the copula is added to the construction as it is: *kimni birök küsi bar ârip tâv kür alî altagî yok ârsâr* ... (PañcÖlm 263) ‘Whoever, however, has power (bar ârip; but) has no tricks and guiles, ...’

Expressions like *tölp* sansar [if(ç/plhâ[i) tîml(i)glarïg nâçå âmgâtgülük tolgakguluk erintîrgülük busamturguluk išlär küdüglär ârsâr,...* (TT II, 2 41-46) ‘However many matters there may be for which to cause pain and affliction to all the creatures in sansvâra’ or *üküš ažunta ašnu ärinätîv atlig balïkta ârnem atlig elîg xan xart* (Arañemi 1 a r13) ‘Many generations ago there was a king named Arañemi in the city named Aruñâvati’ show that *âr*- by itself was also used for expressing existence.

In the following sentences *âr* expresses possession: *bögü bilîlig burxanlûnîg iki törlüg ât’özleri ârïr* (Mait 26A r11) ‘the wise minded Buddhas have two types of bodies’; *sözlügülüs ârsâr* (UigBrief D) ‘if you have anything to discuss’. In *kâk bîrlâ karîlgil savlar kögünînä ärmişkâ* (BT II 991) the translation can be existential (‘because there are things mixed with hate in one’s heart’) or possessive (‘because one has ... in one’s heart’).

*ol*, primarily ‘that’ but also widely used as copula, is also found in sentences indicating existence: *ordo balîk ked[în tagdïn] buluďunta atî bür[â ...] bir sâgrâm ol* (HTs III 273) ‘6 miles to the north-west from the capital there is a monastery’; 611 *ol tamuta ymâ ulgûsîz üküš çadürlig suvîn tolû ulug eșîlçü ol* (DPAMPb 63) ‘Now in that hell there are countlessly numerous large pots full of potash water’.

611 Assuming that the lacuna did not contain anything relevant to this matter.
4.32. Verbal sentence patterns

Verbal sentences, especially sentences with fully or partly lexical verbs, can be analysed as hierarchical structures, in that they consist of noun phrases serving as arguments, of a central verb phrase assigning participant tasks to these arguments and sometimes of adjuncts. The sentence need not include reference to all of its arguments; this reference can very well be supplied by the context without any explicit trace of it appearing in the sentence itself. The lack of such trace is the rule when the reference-supplying context consists of language material; less so when the reference comes from the situation. The tasks carried out by noun phrases within sentences have already been accounted for in section 4.11, where we dealt with the various case functions.

One of the arguments in the verbal sentence will be the subject of the verb. The addressee can be expected to extract reference to the subject, as to any other participant, from the context. All entities retrievable by zero reference are part of or constitute the sentence’s topic. The subject of the second sentence in *biziğ beş yüz ärän kança bardı? ësän tâgdi mù?* ‘Where have our 500 men gone? Have (they) arrived safely?’ (KP 53,4-6) is, of course, meant to be supplied from out of the first, without need to even put *tâgdi* into the plural.

When there is no explicit reference to the subject and its identity is not made clear from the context either, reference to it is understood to be generic. *öntün kedin satiğka yulugka barsar bay bolur* (KP 13-14) signifies ‘One becomes rich if one goes to the east or to the west to trade’. The question to which this statement is an answer is also couched in terms involving a generic subject, and so are the other answers to the same question when presented to other addressees; the sentence itself would have been identical if there had been zero reference to some subject from the context. Another example: *ol tašig özî üzä tutsar kopga utgay ... ol tašig özintä tutsar yat kişi adartu umaz* (Blatt 17-18, 23-24) ‘If one keeps that stone on oneself, one will prevail in everything ... If one keeps that stone on oneself, strangers will not be able to harm one’. This is not basically different (though perhaps less widespread among European languages) than when an oblique argument is neither explicit nor implicit, as the object in the sentence *nâgülük ölürür sizlär* ‘Why do you kill?’; just as the speaker has no specific object in mind in this sentence, he has no specific subject in mind in the previous ones.
In other cases, deverbal noun dummies are used for filling object slots: This, I suspect, is the main reason for the appearance of ölüüt in ölüüt ölüür- ‘to carry out a massacre’ with the verb just mentioned, and çasût çasur- ‘to slander’ (both documented in OTWF 310-11). yol in yol yorî- ‘to travel’ and nom in nom nomla- ‘to preach’ could have been replaced by more specific terms if the speaker / writer had deemed them necessary or had been able to supply them. The appearance of verbal abstract objects is obligatory when these are to be accompanied by their subjects; the phrases arslan silkinिङिङ (or silkinिङिङिङिङ) silikîn-, arslan yarışिङिङ yat- and arslan ilinçिङिङ ilinçülû- are quoted in OTWF 204. yol yorî- shows that a real etymological connection is not necessary between the two elements, although alliteration does appear to be the general rule.

Adjuncts, which express, among other matters, when, where, how or why the event referred to by the sentence takes place, are generally not made obligatory by the grammar. They can consist of phrases or clauses. See section 3.3 for adjuncts, section 4.2 for adjunct phrases and section 4.63 for adjunct clauses.

Predication is sometimes shared between a verb and a nominal, which is unmarked for case. There are three types of this:

Firstly, some intransitive verbs are able to govern descriptive predicative adjectives, e.g. busušlug in nă üçûn busušlug kâltînjiz? ‘Why did you come in sorrow?’ (KP 4,5). Thus also the quantity adjective alku in âdgû törô âdgû kîînî alku kalgay (TT II,1 21) ‘Good habits and good deeds will all stay’. Similarly, certain transitive verbs also govern adjectives which they predicatively apply to their direct objects, as in sakînî arîq tut (ChrManMsFr, ChrFr v 12) ‘Keep (your) thoughts pure!’.

Thirdly, a transitive verb can govern two nouns or pronouns as objects; the second noun (in the nominative) here tells us what the first (in the accusative case) is made to turn into: inscriptional özümûn öfrâ biğa başî ıtiî ‘Myself he sent (id-) forward (as) captain’; Uygur âki kîçîn tapîg berti ‘He gave his two daughters (as) tribute’ or âltî azîgîn ... kâyiîkîkîkî bîsî berî (HTs III 259-60) ‘(The white elephant) gave his six molars to the hunter (as) alms’. A reversal in the order of topic and comment is not excluded; the topic remains evident by being marked with the accusative suffix: enî âsûn kîlzîn mini (U II 64,9) ‘May he make me be well and in peace’. We quoted instances with the verbs id-, ber- and kîl-; yarat- ‘to create’ and ata- ‘to nominate’ are also used with two objects.
Participles are adjectives and could therefore, in principle, also be used predicatively. Some of them, the -dAÇI form in inscriptive Turkic, the aorist, -yOk and -mAyOk, -mlÇ and -mAAdOk, -(mA-)gU and -(mA-)gULX forms in the whole of Old Turkic, could serve both as participles and as finite verb forms. The meaning of -yOk, -mAyOk, -mlÇ and -mAAdOk is different when they are participles and when they are not, which means that – given the context – confusion between participle and finite form was unlikely. When, however, we e.g. find an aorist form in predicative position, the predicate can in principle be understood either as a verbal or as a nominal one: mänïy köyülün nay ananmaç (TT II,1 40) could signify either ‘my heart hasn’t been calming down’ or ‘my heart is a quite unstable one’. 613 In some such instances the distinction between ‘finite’ and ‘non-finite’ may possibly disappear in main or in subordinate clauses. In the case of the aorist, finite use, which is statistically more common than participial use, will be the hearer / reader’s first (and hence only) choice.

The distinction between verbal and nominal predicates is blurred also through the existence of a well documented hybrid class: There are subordinating pronouns and conjunctions governing infinite subordinate clauses, both with participles and converbs, e.g. muntada adýn taþi ëyi aþ içgû yok kim bo ... aþ barsiþ tirgûrgûluk ‘There is here no other different food or drink with which to revive this ... hungry tigress’; tînlîg oþlanî yok kim mänïy ... kam kadaþim bolmadî ârsâr ‘there are no living creatures who did not become my relatives (in previous lives)’. For Old Turkic, where verb forms capable of nominal behaviour possess all verbal categories, one might want to do away with the notion of finiteness and deal only with categorial bundles in word classes.

Unlike many (but not all) languages, 1st and 2nd person verbs forms can also be accompanied by nominal subjects, not only pronominal ones. Three Orkhon Turkic examples among many, with the 1st and 2nd persons singular and the 2nd person plural: ilgûrà barîguna bardîg, kurîgaru barîguna bardîg (KT E23-24, BQ E20) ‘Those of you who went east departed and those of you who went west departed (as well)’; yigirmi kûn orlorup bo taþka bo tamka kop Yollug Tegin bitidim (KT SE) ‘I (but the text contains no apposition), Y. T., wrote all of it on this

612 There is no evidence that -mAÇI, which serves as negative counterpart of -dAÇI in the inscriptions, was used as a participle; in Uygur we find -mAAdÇI in participial use. -dOK forms, on the other hand, are never found in finite use, though -mAAdOK is.

613 In the second case it might be necessary to end the sentence with ol (see section 4.31), as e.g. in kûk taþrî yaþin kilmâlar ol (HtsBiogr 130) ‘They have done it in the manner of heavens’.
stone, on this wall, sitting (at it) for 20 days’. ölülü yurtda yolta yatu kaltarä ärtigiz (KT N9) ‘(All these, my mother the queen, my mothers, elder sisters, daughters in law and princesses, who would survive would become female slaves); the dead among you would be left lying in deserted camps and on the road’: The adjective ölül ‘dead’ is the subject of the 2nd person plural verb phrase kaltarä ärtigiz. Here an example from the 4th (runiform) Stein ms. (l.6): ati iç apa totok ulatï kamïg atïg yâzlüg otuz är kültimiz ‘thirty of us came, all men of renown, the (ruler’s) nephew Ö. A. totok and the others’. The best rendering of the content of this Old Turkic sentence into English included a series of appositions, but this does not correspond to its actual structure: That presents 30 men with certain attributes and mentioning one of them, as formal subject of a 1st person plural finite verb.

-mA- negates verb forms. Double negation gives positive meaning, as -mAdOkXm yok, or in tïnlïg oglanï yok kim mäniğ ögüm kaçüm ... bolmadi ärsär ‘there are no living beings who did not become my parents’. The following negates the copula instead of the topic or the predicate: alko tïnlïglar mäniğ yatïm ârmäzlär ‘All beings are not foreign to me (= none are my strangers)’. The negativity of a super-ordinated verb does not extend to a subordinated one; one example among many is takï kamag kamlar ter(i)lâp nâñ tîrgûrmâgây ‘Even all the magicians will, assembling, definitely not bring him back to life’. Therefore, converbs have to be additionally negated: burxan kutïlïg kästüsîntä ançakï(y)a smâ tînmâtîn kîlguluk išiña ... arîtï armadî (U IVA 272) ‘Not leaving off a bit in his wish for Buddhahom he did not at all get tired ... of the task he was to carry out’.

4.4. The organization of information in the sentence

The second way to analyse a sentence (the first way being what we looked at in section 4.3) is to deal with the flow and organization of information taking place in it. In Old Turkic the most salient means for this purpose is constituent order. The content of sentences in which the same information is organized differently will generally be understood in the same way as far as truth values are concerned.

The order of sentence constituents is in Old Turkic strongly topic – comment oriented in all stages of the language, all styles and text sorts and all putative dialects; other purposes served by constituent order can be iconicity (‘first noted first mentioned’), the linking of elements to previous sentences and the forward motion of the plot. When the topic is purely deictic, the relevant pronoun is added after the
predicate. Otherwise, the last constituents in a sentence normally belong to the predicate. Moving constituents around so as to arrange them in the topic–comment order is simpler with the nominal sentence than with sentences having a finite verb, which is why we will start with that. An example for a nominal sentence is ädgü+g ol arınc (KT) which, considering the context, can have a translation like ‘That is probably the good you got from it’. Again translated freely, mânîy sakîncîm ymâ antag ok (HTsBiogr 229) is ‘Now that is what I think’.

In both of these cases, the demonstrative is predicate. In exclamative nominal sentences the topic–comment order can be reversed: amcama ädgü mânî yârâr kîsâmîs kîsâsîlar känmakî (MaitH XV 13r6) ‘What great joy it is when what one had hoped for is fulfilled!’ Non-finite verb forms can also be either topics or comments in nominal sentences, but that will be dealt with further on, as the construction is used for making the verb of a verbal sentence unpredicative.

In the following sentence a nominal clause is made the object of a verb of thinking; stating the clause which is the object of bil- is more important to the writer than giving first position to the rather general subject of the whole sentence: tükal bilgâ târîj hûrzân yarîkamiş köni kertü nommuît tîntîlîlar bo montag yegîn adrokîn bîzûnîlîr (TT X 557-559) ‘May living beings know that the rightful and true doctrine preached by the perfectly wise divine Buddha is so superior and excellent’ or ‘May the living beings know this superiority and excellence of the...’. This object clause could by itself have been tükal bilgâ târîj hûrzân yarîkamiş köni kertü nom ärtî yeg adrok ol (or ârtîr).

Left dislocation topicalises both in nominal and in verbal sentences. In the following nominal sentence the interrogative phrase nâ tûrîlûg kîshî ‘what sort of a person’ is in its normal initial position; however, the topic pushes itself before it for prominence, not without leaving demonstrative bo as trace: bo montag körksûz ... yatagma nâ tûrîlûg kîshî bo (ChrManMsFr ManFr r 5) ‘This (person) lying there in such an ugly way, what sort of a person is he?’ Another nominal sentence showing left-dislocation is kazganê nûy tariq tarîmakaða ädgü yok (KP 13,2) ‘As for profit, there is absolutely none better than in agriculture’, the undislocated place of kazganê would have been after ädgü, its

614 The +g is a variant of the 2nd person possessive suffix, here referring to the beneficiary of ‘the good’, i.e. the advantage.

615 In Turkish such trace demonstratives are unstressed. This must have been the case also in Old Turkic, where they are placed after the predicate instead of being in the normal topic position yat-agma is a participle representing the subject of the action of ‘lying down’.
attribute. What is important to note is that under such movement no government relationships are changed.

Left dislocation of the topic is rather common also in verbal sentences, where we find two types: Either topic and subject are referentially identical, or the latter is different but in some way related to the former (e.g. by being part of it); the matter has been discussed in Erdal 1998b. Here is an example for topic / subject identity under left dislocation; reference to the topic is effected by the possessive suffix on är-mär+i: tägrikänimiz uzun özün kalın kutun turkaru adasazan tudasazan ärniği bolzun ärti (BT V 516-8) ‘Our majesty, I wish he were to attain a long life, that he were to live full of blessing and that he were continuously free from trouble’. The type with distinct topic and subject is sometimes called ‘double subject construction’. It is found e.g. in inscriptional karlok tärigi barį turgäška kirti ‘As for the K., all among them who saved their lives joined the T.’. The sentence êkögämän yoli bir ärmiš, tumış”teyin äşıdip ...”t edim, yerçi tilädim (Tuñ 23) ‘As for the Sayan (range), I heard that there was only one way across it and that it was blocked, and said ...’, finally, is another example for the phenomenon. In both examples the topic, Karlok or Kögmän, is in the basic case form, and reference to it is taken up by the possessive suffixes of tärig+i bar+i and yol+i. yol+i bir is a nominal clause with copula, serving as a complex predicate (or ‘comment’), as the sentence tärigi barį turgäška kirti serves as complex predicate. The sentence with barį reminds us of tetselar üküš i körmädin äşidmädin kaltîlar (HTs VIII 74) ‘The students mostly went on not to see and not to hear’, or ‘As for the students, most of them (üküš+i) remained ...’. The most salient ‘relationship’ is the inalienability of body parts, as between the subject and his mouth in the following: kayu kiši agičinîn äyriq sarsîg sav iünsîr ... anta ok tägir i burxanig öp sakûnip inça veçin (DKPAMPb 539) ‘If a person has used harsh and abusive language, let him think of divine Buddha and utter this’. kayu kiši is the subject of the main verbs, for which the nominative is normal; by making it precede the conditional clause with sav as its subject, the possessive suffix of agič+in+sûn serving as only link between the two clauses, we effectively get the situation where the person is not directly to blame for the harsh and abusive language while remaining the topic. In the following Manichaean example (M I nr. 8 VII r2-4) resumptive ol kiši is topicalised because it takes up the generalising kanyu kiši: kanyu kiši

616 We know that tägrikänim is not a vocative standing outside the sentence, as it is preceded by the vocative tägrikänı. The sentence is followed by another two, which show a similar structure.
kim bo yarokun ärmäk[ig] känntä köngüän içrä tarümiš ärsär, ol kişi bülüsü antag ärür ‘Whatever person has planted this existing with light into his own heart, that person — his characterisation (bülüsü-si) is as follows:’. In a sentence in Mait XV 10v13 kamag tınlaglar (thus) ‘all creatures’ is the topic while az övkä biligsiz biligläri ‘their ignorance of lust and anger’ is the subject.

Grammatically redundant pronouns are made to start sentences for contrast against other participants, e.g. Orkhon Turkic biz az ärtimiz yavïz ärtimiz ‘As for us, we were few and in a bad state’.

In ol kim burxan tetir, nom ol ok ärür (TT VI 418), Buddha manages to become both topic and comment. The sentence says ‘That which (or ‘He who …’) is called Buddha, the teaching is nothing else but him’ (or ‘that’). I have chosen the ‘nothing else but’ construction to render focussing through the particle ok. What we have is the nominal sentence nom ol ärür, with both topic and predicate, the nexus getting predicated upon the noun phrase ol kim burxan tetir, which consists of a demonstrative qualified by a relative clause. The meaning basically to be conveyed is that Buddha and the teaching are one and the same. The author could therefore have written burxan nom ärür or nom burxan ärür if he had not intended to stress the import of this identity. However, beside ok to underline the status of Buddha as predicate he chose to apply to Buddha left dislocation as well, leaving ol as trace in the kernel sentence.

The element ärsär is exceedingly common as topicaliser, e.g. 'avgač eli äräsr, marïçi atïlig uč kïdïg türgeš yer ol ‘As for China, that is a Turkish, Turgeshian, distant land of the Mleccha sort’; siz tïdïmlïg xanlarnï güz yïltïzda siz … män ärïsr tïgrï yalavaçi män (Wettkampf 53) ‘You are from the root of crowned kings … As for me, I am a messenger of God’. There is very extensive listing of such instances in §§ 29-33 of the entry är- in the UW, pp. 406-407. An example where tesär is used for the same purpose is quoted in chapter VI. Both words have survived in Turkic languages as topicalisers to this day.

We stated above that it is not simple to move the finite verb around in the Old Turkic sentence; the reason for this is that finite verb forms have a strong affinity with the position at the end of a sentence. Finite verb forms are, however, moved away from the end for purposes other than topic / comment structure, in the following types:

Imperatives and other verb forms signaling an unusual energy on the mind of the speaker are sometimes left-dislocated: ögsüz kalmïš bo þiï fïnilïg ämïgïmin ämïp bolzun mïnïy oglum (PaçiÖlm 29) ‘(I’ll) let this poor creature suck my teats and — well then — let it become my child!’; ‘tal atïn’ tedim (Tuñ I N1) ‘Dive (into it) with (your) horses’
I said’. otg[urak] kertgünzün bo savag (TT X 467) ‘Let her put all her trust in these words!’ In Suv 609,11 the prince who is ready to sacrifice his body for the hungry tigress says: bulgay ärki biz yeg adrok buyanïg ‘We will maybe (or ‘hopefullly’) attain excellent punya’. Great emotion also brings the verb to initial position: muq ay muq ay, yiitïmiš män isig sâvâr amrak atayümün ‘Oh sorrow, oh sorrow, I have lost my dear baby, whom I love warmly’ (Suv 623,10); kalmïš sïnïk yer sayu, içïnimïš män kânïjïmïn, sâvâr amrak atayümün (Suv 626,16-17) ‘The bones lie a round everywhere, I have lost my baby, my dear chick whom (I) love’. The sentence aşuknaz mu korgïluq, finally, was written by an old father in a letter he sent to his son in an emotional plea to come for a visit (UigBrief C12); it signifies ‘Doesn’t your heart yearn (for us)?’ but a freer translation in the context could be ‘Aren’t you homesick?’

A causal relationship between events can bring the verbs to the fore and make them precede subjects: ymä yegädti y(a)rok kïn (k)arïg tünïg alpaïdartï ... ymä anta ken [âr]ksïnïr elçïnïr eligïlïr xïnlar k(a)ntï öz elïn içrä (M III nr.8 III v10-15) ‘And the bright day vanquished the dark night and weakened it; ... and thereupon they rule and govern, the kings and rulers, within their own realms’.

Converb phrases connecting with the pre-text can precede the subject when the action is a direct reaction: munï körüï bodïsätv ... ärtïmiï kôrkïçi sezïntï (Suv 630,10) ‘When he saw this, the bodhisattva, ... he became exceedingly frightened ... and worried’; anï körüï yïklïr bàgi vayïşïrvanï tïgri, yaşïlg közïn yïglïyuvu ... (TT X 296) ‘When he saw that, the lord of the demons the god Vaiïravana, ... he wept with wet eyes and ...’.

S – O – V is the unmarked order, S being preceded by connectives (such as anta ötrö ‘thereupon’). Other object positions demand explanations. In the following example, e.g., the locative precedes the subject in order to stress the distance of the two goals: üstïn akiïnïبطïvaban alïn aïsï tamu ... yer saviïlda ol yçïr yaltïrik tïgïr ‘That bright gleam reaches all the way to the A. above and the Avïciïhell ... worlds below’. Objects can also precede the subject when they are topics carried over from the preceding co-text; e.g. çïk bodïnïg biçïm sïrï kïltï ‘The Ç. tribe was driven hither by my military unit’.

The accusative is pushed to the first part of the sentence also when something else occupies focus position, e.g. elig tïrïg agï harïm tutar (KP 9,1) ‘Money (agï harïm) is what keeps the state (el tïrï) going’. In the following Orkhon Turïc example, ïd, the direct object, is topic; it precedes tïgïr, the subject, which is focus of the utterance: ïd tïgïr aysar kïşï oglï kop ölgïlï tïrïmiš ‘Since it is god who determines
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timing (üd), the sons of men are all born to die.' The reason for üd ‘time’ lacking the accusative suffix might be its genericity; the sentence is uttered in consolation for death. In örgün anta yaratıdïm, ñït anta tokïtdïm (ŞU) the unmarked direct objects precede the locatives, which are in focus: ‘It was there that I had my throne (örgün) erected and a (border) fence (ñït) set up’. In bo buyanag üy öyïrë öyïrë brï tïñri hïrgo el bilgï arslan tïñri uyqur tïrkânimiz kütña and similar sentences in the colophon of MaitH Y, the deflection of puuya (buyan öyïr-) is topic, the person to whom it is deflected (in dative case) the relevant new information.

Personal pronouns follow nominal predicates as they follow the verb, presumably lacking stress (as in modern Turkic). This means that the topic follows the comment when this topic is a personal pronoun, instead of preceding it. Hence the placing of a personal pronoun at the end cannot be used as an indication for its being predicative. It is an indication that it is getting cliticised and turning into a grammatical personal marker without any role in the topic-comment structure. The sentence tüçïm,.bizï yarïktïgï buyanï tëkïtï tüçïm siz (BT V 400-402) is to be translated as ‘My lord, it is you (siz) who are the true god of good practices, who commiserate with us’ with ‘you’ as comment. This corresponds to Turkish sizsiniz: The first siz is comment, the second the trace of the copula. If ‘you’ were a neutral topic we would have *tüçïm bizï yarïktïgï buyanï tëkïtï tüçïm siz, while *tüçïm siz bizï yarïktïgï buyanï tëkïtï tüçïm siz, with siz added in the first position, would mean that the 2nd person is being contrasted with other possible topics.

The position just before the verb serves focussing: In tüçïtï yïkli yarokli karalï ol üdïn katïlï (Xw 7), e.g., ol üdïn ‘at that time’ is in focus: ‘It was then that gods and demons, light and darkness were mingled’. When the focus position just before the verb is occupied, non-finite elements can be pushed after the verb; this may be the reason for the place of the converb in the following sentence: tegin kaçï xanka înçà tep ötiñdï ölgayu: ‘...’ ‘Crying, the prince spoke the following words to his father the king: ‘...’ (KP 4,7). For the purpose of focussing, predicative direct objects can be moved away from preverbal position also when they have no accusative marking: uçugma k[uşlar] kälïp tämirliq yiti tarmaklar[în] içï tançï tançï atïmizïniz iç[ü]p] eltïrlïr (MaitH XX 14r14) ‘Flying birds come and with their iron claws tear away our flesh piece by piece’. The unmarked place of tançï tançï would have been adjacent to the verb; the correct
formulation of the process may just be that elements get stressed by being moved from their normal position, whatever it is.

Here three Christian examples for the postponement of the indirect object: bo ... buyan ädögü kilinçög äŋ öyğä avirir biz ... tört ... täyrilärkä ‘We transfer the credit for this meritorious deed first of all to the four ... gods’; ol üdıün Xerodes xan inça tep yarlıkadi olarka (U I Magier 3) ‘Then king Herod decreed the following to them’; barüp yükündäyin agar (U I Magier 8) ‘let me go and worship him’; yükündi—yükündilär ögmük alkiš ötündilär elig xan m(ä)šiixa täyrikä (U I Magier 20) ‘they worshipped and expressed praises and blessings towards the divine king Messias’. pašik sözläğüg ayu yarlıkadiñiz olarka ‘you graciously admonished them to sing hymns’ (from a Manichæan text) also places the backgrounded indirect object after the verb.

Beside this there is the phenomenon of right dislocation, where a sentence or clause with a demonstrative in situ is followed by an apposition to that demonstrative: In the sentence seni inça sivär män ayadakı yincu moncok tág ‘I love you as much as jewels and pearls in one's hand’ (KP 6,8), ayadakı yincu moncok tág stands in apposition to inça. While, in this sentence, inça points forwards, munı in the following sentence points backwards: munı körüp bodisatv, montag osoglüg ärtökä, ... ärtiŋä korkdï sezinti (Suv 630,10) ‘He saw this, the bodhisattva, i.e. that this was the situation, and became exceedingly frightened ... and worried.’. In this second case, both the subject and the apposition giving semantic content to the anaphoric demonstrative are postposed. The reason here, again, is the strong emotional content of the passage (referring as direct object to the state of the prince sacrificing himself). In Zieme’s edition of the Uygur translation of the devatāśūtra (a2-3) we read: nā antag ād ol [ag]uta [fakti] katrïgrak, nā antag ād ol yalar otta käd örtäyür etc., signifying ‘What is such a thing that it is stronger than poison? What is such a thing that it flares

617 ‘Alttürkische Fragmente aus dem Devatāśūtra’. W. Gantke et al. (eds.), Religionsbegegnung und Kulturaustausch in Asien. Studien zum Gedenken an Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2002: 226-244. We quote two among four such sentences, the other two being even more fragmentary. The editor's reconstruction is based on parallelisms, on the answers to these questions (which are also, however, fragmentary) and on the Chinese and Sanskrit versions. The less likely analysis is to consider nā antag ād ol to be a complete nominal sentence and yalar otta käd örtäyür an asyndetic relative clause, similar to the analysis of the sentence bo montag körksüz yatagma nā törlüg kiiś bo ‘This (person) lying there in such an ugly way, what sort of a person is he?’ offered at the beginning of this section: That would only have been possible under left dislocation, yumşakrak in a10 is an emendation for a word which looks similar but is not understandable.
up stronger than fire? ...’. Then (a10) nā antag ād ol bīntaduta takī yumṣakrak ‘What is such a thing that it is softer than silk?’. We here have three interrogative nominal sentences where the attributes of ād are right-dislocated, leaving the cataphoric demonstrative antag as trace. The first and third right-dislocated elements are adjectives with satellites while the second one is a relativized sentence with no mark of subordination (as the conjunction kim would have been). Parallel mss. instead use other means of text organization, nā antag ād bar ‘What sort of a thing is there ...’ or nā antag ād ol kim ‘What sort of a thing is it that ...’.

Now take kišig .. yinik körta, nomug uuzladunlar ümsn, aniīn burxanlar anta tugmaz; körta, körta tarkim kün kut bulmuşt tüzsünlar bo tīltəqın anta barmaz (HTs V 100-106) ‘Because they humiliate people and disparage teaching, that is why Buddhas are not born there; because their mind are narrow and their filth deep, for that reason əyas who have found blessing do not go there’: The anaphoric elements aniīn and bo tīltəqín echo the reference on the expressed causes for further prominence. Similarly in HTs III 665: mān sini nizvani kadgu[lar]n tarkarın arxan utu bulturgalı, aniūn sūrūp üntürdüm ‘To make you get rid of the passions of sorrow618 and find arhathood - that is why I drove you away’.

Topics established as such in the text stretch preceding a sentence can be right-dislocated. Take bo montag asığ tuśu kildachi üčın bo nom ārdini, aniīn ol šoklarıg tükäl bititti ‘It is because this süra-jewel does this much good that he (i.e. the Chinese emperor) had those gāthās written out in full’ in BT I A 2 19-21. The süra in question is mentioned (and praised) in l.4 (bo kimkoki atlıg nom ārdini), l.9 (bo nom ārdini), l.14 (bo kimkoki nom) and referred to with a zero anaphoric in l.17 (where the reader has to understand it to be the object of a verb). Then follows the sentence quoted above, where this reference is taken up with a noun phrase, placed in post-predicative position: In a sentence following upon one with zero anaphora, the author chose to take up explicit reference, but without putting the referential noun phrase into a position which establishes topicality.

In ‘bar ārsär māni• azkya ārsär ymā münüm kadagım, ... eri•lär münälär” tep, ıtūzdəkimin ārsär ymā, ıtūzdəkimin ārsär ymā, kömefuləkim in ārsär ymā” (BT III 543-545) ‘He said ‘If I have even a bit of sins, ... criticise and chastise them, be they my sins of body, of

---

618 I do not think nizvani kadgu[lar] is either ‘Leidenschaften;’ as translated by Rührborn or ‘aćılar;’ as translated into Turkish by Ölmez; it is unlikely to be a binome as the meanings of the two words are too far apart.
tongue or of heart.” there is right dislocation of three locative satellites to ‘my sins’ (the binome mün+üm kadag+ım); these satellites take up the possessive suffix of this latter. Interestingly, the accusative form of the satellites echoes the function of the head as direct object, although that has nominative and not accusative form.

Question pronouns generally appear in situ; e.g. māniŋ köşim känča baryok ol (U II 25.21) ‘Where has my daughter gone?’; biz ikigung kanyusı kücliğrük biz? (Wettkamp 43) ‘Who among us two is the stronger?’. In rhetorical questions, e.g. elin i türögın kım armatı ıdaçı ārtı (BQ E19) ‘Who could have harmed your realm and your system?’;
elig bodun ārtım; elim amti kani (KT E9) ‘I was a nation with a realm; where is my realm now?’; otsuz suvsuz kaltı uyın, năčuk yoriyın (IrqB 45) ‘How should I manage, how can I live without grass and water?’;
muntada munadinčig naxı bolgay ‘What could be more wondrous than this?’ (Mait 26A r4). In the following sentence an interrogative pronoun in indefinite use is the sentence’s subject: kim kayu kusası Ketumati ānttäki ... kutlug tınlıglar ara ā tizü o lorup a šagalı, bırlıolorup mäñılägäli, ol kişi ādgı kılımcık ’Whoever wishes to enjoy sitting among the blessed creatures of Ketumatı and to make music, to sit together and be happy, that person should perform good deeds’. It can then happen, as in this example, that it attracts the verb away from clause-final position. Even more so with real interrogatives with 1st or 2nd person subjects: năkă tazăr biz (Tuñ 38) ‘What are we fleeing from?; kămka elig kazganur măın (KT E9) ‘Whom am I conquering countries for?’; nă üçım hasuslug kältinįz? (KP 4.5) ‘Why did you come (back) saddened?; năgülük ölürür sizlär ‘Why do you kill?’; nă tusu bolgay ‘What use will it be?; känča borgalı sakınur siz ‘Where are you planning to go? In DKPAMPb 840 a child addresses his father with a chain of five rhetorical questions, two of them with mU after the verb, two with left dislocation of wh° forms and one (marked by ārki) with the pronoun in situ; these are: känča bardı sānığ burxan kutılıg ādgı sakınıŋ? kımni üçım mıni monuq āmgägälı buși bértinį? yarlıkanınlı kığılın kanna yiţinįp bardı ārki? ‘Which way did your good thoughts linked to Buddhahood go? For whom have you given me as alms to cause me so much pain? Where did your pity disappear to, I wonder?’ In the following instance, finally, the nominalized topic is pushed out of initial position by an interrogative: nă tusu bolur (or: bulur) ol ādgı kinn, ol ādgı üd körmişi talalamısı (TT VI 23) ‘Of what use will it be (to him) that he looked for and found out a suitable day and a suitable hour?’

If the verbal content is not predicative (i.e. not part of the ‘comment’), the sentence can be clefted by putting the verb into non-
finite form (here äšitöküm): In üküš tâlim nomlarïg äšitöküm yok ärti ... amtï yügüri äšidtim ... bo nomug (Suv 670,14) ‘There were many teachings which I had never heard; now I have listened to this teaching (being preached) right before me’ it is the negation which is in focus; the neutral expression would have been äšidmâdim. In the following sentence the subject is in focus; for this purpose the particle Ok is placed after (and the adjective yalağuz before) it, and the verb is made into a participle, turning the sentence into a nominal one, whereby the subject appears in the second half of the sentence: anï bïltïœçi yalağuz buryanlar ok ârïr (BT I D(14)) ‘It is only the Buddhhas who know that’. In the sentence ol yükïnï äšitm kaqrï altïn yalïyûka kim ârsar kïœcïn küdtaœï yok (TT X 104-106) ‘There is nobody, neither among gods above nor among humans below, who restrains the power of that demon’ yâk, ‘the demon’, is topic, brought to a position before the subject and thereby separated from its head; yok is shown to be the main predicate by the nominalisation of the verb, again changing a verbal to a nominal sentence pattern. In the following passage the clefting serves focussing on the identity of the subject: kim ârïtï ârki bïödaœï ëqïkkiyûm ât’özïn? ... kim ârïtï ârki ölürtäœï ëgïkkiyûm çâk sïnï? (Suv 626,14-19) ‘Who could it have been who slashed the body of my darling? ... Who was it, I wonder, who killed you of all people?’. sizni sävûmâkimiz montag ol ‘This is how we love you’ (HTs VII 1880) figures a non-finite verb form to focus on montag: The variant with finite verb would presumably have been *sizni montag sävûr biz.

In yeg ërdöküm ol (E24,5) ‘That is how I succeeded’ and in tirïg oztum, kâltöküm bo (KP 61,1) ‘I survived alive. Here I am’ it is demonstrative pronouns which get the full predicative weight. A -dOk form is topic for a demonstrative also in Kapgan xagan, Türk Sir bodun yorïdokï bu (Tuñ II N3) ‘This is how K. k. and the Turk (or: “united”) Sir people fared’. The following sentences with copula are construed similarly: kallï tül tüñïp odumïiï tïg tirïltöküm bo ârïr (Suv 16, 15-16) ‘This is how I came back to life, as if, e.g., I had dreamt and woken up’; yerig tupulup yokuœs ënmiœ gi bo ârïr (Suv 644,4) ‘This is how it made a hole in the brown earth and came up’. This construction lived on, with -dOk, in Qarakhanid: oš kâldöküm bo is, in DLT fol.30 translated as ‘I have just come’: oš here makes the presentative element even more explicit. Interestingly, most of the -dOk forms are in the 1st person. In a lecture held in Frankfurt in November 2002, E. Skribnik documented this construction, with predicative bo or ol, from Tuven and Altay Turkic.

The main clause in the following sentence was clefted to create a focus for the temporal adjunct: ârïtimliq ât’özïm içïnsar mân, kayu
kün bolgây munî tâg tükällig kišî ärözin bulgum? (U II 88-89) signifies ‘When I lose my transient body, on which day will it be that I find a perfect human body like this one?’ The uncialled version would have been *kayu kün ... kiši ärözin bulgay män? Interestingly, the writer’s hope is built into the projection participle bul-gu.

Definiteness or specificity do not as such appear to be expressed by case marking. That constituents appearing earlier in the sentence tend to be more definite, i.e. better known to speaker and hearer and more within the universe of discourse, is a universal phenomenon and no doubt correct also in this language.

4.5. The structure of the participant group

For the representation of relationships between entities participating in an event the language uses a number of different and interacting means: First of all there are the verb bases, each with a typical set of participant characteristics, i.e. what set of nominals they can govern and in which cases. Those governing direct objects are called transitive, those not governing direct objects intransitive, but one would need a much richer set of terms to classify verb bases in this way: Their government of other case forms (e.g. the dative) is also of high grammatical relevance. Moreover, some verb stems are associated with more than one government pattern, sometimes as linked to different meanings; in some of these cases, it can be argued that such a verb stem in fact represents more than one verbal lexeme. Still within the lexicon (and therefore not, strictly speaking, the object of this work but described in OTWF), any intransitive verb stem can, in Old Turkic, be turned to a transitive one by adding one of the seven causative formatives or formative combinations to it.\(^\text{619}\) Secondly, the different diathetical suffixes added to the verb (including the causative suffixes) define distinctive grammatical sentence structures, especially if lexicalisation of these derived stems does not lead them to special meanings and away from sentence patterns characteristic for each one of them. Thirdly there are the governed nominals referring to the participants in the action, consisting at least of one word (unless we have zero anaphora pointing to some entity outside the clause as

\(^\text{619}\) The various causative suffixes are in complementary distribution for some of the stem shapes as defined phonologically, but not in all cases. They should be treated as separate suffixes both for this reason, and because their grammatical characteristics by no means overlap completely.
defined by the verb in question), which fall into semantic classes on one hand and, on the other hand, are characterised by case forms.

Zero slots can by the addressee be filled either from out of the context or through his world knowledge. See OTWF 785, 795-6 concerning the ellipsis of direct objects because of expected addressee knowledge in the military domain, the verbs akît-, sekrit- / sekirt- and yor(î)t- taking ‘horse(s)’ as implicit object and thus being used as intransitive verbs in spite of their causative shape. Similarly, Röhrborn 2000 states that the verbs cõkit-, bõdit-, agrît-, täprült-, bâlgürt-, ürkit-, bâlinjâr-, âjîr-, tolga- and the DLT’s yîlît-620 are used with the subject’s body or a part of his body as implicit object. In a few cases this ultimately led to relexicalisation as an intransitive verb; in the corpus, the object does, however, resurface either when it has to be qualified by an adjective or for some contextual reason. The problem which we have with ellipsis is that, in the less common cases, it is not clear which lexeme should actually be the understood object: With the sentence nâcâkin takî adkanta biliglär ... ürkitgâli bâlinjâgâli ugay quoted by Röhrborn 2000: 270 from HTs, âtözin ‘his body’ is unlikely to be the implicit goal, as he thinks; with verbs signifying ‘to frighten’ the object should be less physical.

Passive sentences have verbs formed with -(X)l- or, in late Buddhist texts, -(X)l- or -tUrXl-, getting the patient as grammatical subject. They usually lack an explicit agent; in later texts they are sometimes accompanied by a constituent referring to the agent, governed by the postposition âzä. See OTWF 691-93 and 699-700 for the syntax of verbs formed with these formatives. The normal earlier way of deriving passive verbs with explicit agent was to add to them the formative -Xl- and put this agent into the dative case.

When one of the seven causative formatives is added to transitive bases, we have different constructions depending on what case forms the argument nominals governed by the verb are in; the different possibilities are discussed in OTWF 834-845. The instances involve agents or instigators, targets and, mediating between these, intermediate causees or intermediate agents, whose task may be seen as active (from the point of view of the target) or passive (from the point of view of the instigator).

-(X)s- verbs have two (groups of) participants (in plural) vying or cooperating with each other. They are often accompanied by the phrase

---

620 This has the secondary meaning ‘to get fever’. Röhrborn 2000: 272 points out a similar development behind Turkish kizârma ‘fever’ and the verb âgîr- ‘to frighten’ and the verb âgîr- ‘to catch a cold’. Another such case is Turkish stîma ‘malaria’, which comes from stî-t-ma.
'one another', which appears as *bir ikintikä* in M I 9,9 and Maue 1996 44a v6; alternatively, they have one participant vying with (*birlä*) another, the parties being either direct or indirect objects of each other. The content of 'vying' is not necessarily linked to the use of -(X)š-; cf. *kiçiümüz bir ikinti birlä sinalım biz* ‘Let us compete with each other in strength’ (Wettkampf 41-43); DreiPrinz 119-120 has no doubt also been correctly completed as [*bir*] ikinti birlä. The cooperating or vying participants in an action are either both subjects, or one party is the subject, carrying out the action *with* or *against* the other. However, even in this latter case and when the subject is singular, Old Turkic (unlike Western European languages) puts the verb in the plural; *ini Köl Tegin birlä sözlä š dimiz* (KT E 26), e.g., signifies ‘I discussed the matter with my younger brother Köl Tegin’. One of the original meanings of the -(X)š- formative (retained to this day in Kïrgïz) may have been the expression of verbal plurality; thus e.g. in *bešiné ay üc yegirmikä kališdï* ‘on the 13th of the 5th month they made an uprising’ in Tariat S3, referring to the Türk tribes after getting vanquished by the Uygur confederation. See OTWF 578-583 for more details.

Verbs formed with -(X)n- are reflexive or middle (in which case they can govern direct objects) or anti-transitive (intransitive derivates of transitive bases); a number of them can be semantically characterised as having an abstract metaphorical meaning distinct from the concrete meaning of their base. See OTWF 634-639 for details on the syntax and semantics of -(X)n- verbs. Verbs formed with the rare and obsolete -(X)d- formative all show middle voice while all -(X)k- and -(X)n- verbs (the first discussed in OTWF 650-51, the second in OTWF 641-42) are anti-transitive. Sentences need not have any of these forms to show middle content: *el[ig] bág ... özüng olorgu üv etdürti* (HTs III 739), e.g. signifies ‘The king ... had a house made for himself to live in’.

-(X)d- forms sentences with the patient (a creature with a will of its own) as subject (like a passive) but (in a few examples) the accusative of something by which the subject suffers; see OTWF 705-6. All -(X)d- verbs (as all -(X)n- verbs) have transitive bases; they represent the subject as responsible for the action he undergoes, and get the active causee in the dative case; see OTWF 709 for the use of verbs formed with this suffix.

When a subject slot is not filled and no zero anaphor is in sight either, the subject can be ‘any appropriate argument’; ‘somebody’ in the example *tümürlig ologin olümüş osuqluk* (MaitH XVNachtr 4r25) ‘as if somebody had wrung (them, i.e. foetuses in their mothers’ belly) with an iron wrench’. The verb *ölï*- has no explicit subject. It would
have been wrong to translate ‘as if wrung with a ... wrench’ as the verb was not passivized. In section 5.2 we deal with impersonal necessity, where the speaker / writer uses various means for expressing a directive he applies to anybody. The conditional does not need to fill the subject slot either: 

\[ \text{mužit tägir yeriştäği yıl sanın sanasar tükäl tört müy yıl ärdü; yalıqar sanınça högsär alıq yetü költä alı yüz tümän yıl ärtüşiş ärür (MaitH X 1v10-12)} \]

‘If (one) reckons it by the years of the divine tüşita country 4000 years all in all went by; if (one) sums it up by human reckoning 57 kotís and 6 million years have passed’. Using \textit{tep tesär} ‘if one says’ is a very common strategy for asking rhetorical questions then answered by the author himself; ‘one’ here represents a hypothetical interlocutor.

Such non-reference to subjects happens also with finite verb forms, as with \textit{tägir} in the following passage: 

\[ \text{ol yolça barip aritii sansarênin ozgali bolmaz; kayu üdün bo tüzün yolça harsar yemın ök ugramiš äriq amal nirvan balvikka tägir (MaitH Y 328)} \]

‘Going by that way it is quite impossible to get free from \textit{samsařa}; when one takes this righteous way, one reaches straightway the intended eternal peaceful city of \textit{nîrvinq}.’ As \textit{Zieme} points out in \textit{TDA} 10(2000): 67, alternative readings in Chinese-Uygur bilinguals are often introduced with the words \textit{... ymä ter} ‘One also says ...’. Further instances where slots opened by finite verbs are left empty are mentioned in section 4.32.

4.6. Clause subordination

The transformation of verbal clauses to sentence constituents is mostly taken care of by morphology, i.e. through the replacement of finite and other predicative verb forms by participles and converbs. These appear to have been the only means available to the language of the inscriptions, beside the use of \textit{te-yin} and \textit{te-p} in the creation of causal and final clauses within a direct speech strategy. In Uygur, however, conjunctions such as \textit{kim} also have important tasks, and that dialect conglomerate makes much use of pronouns such as \textit{kim} ‘who’ (sometimes joined to verb forms in -\textit{sAr}) in subordinating. The predication of a subordinate clause can fill the task of any of the constituents of the main clause except the verb; we shall here deal with these tasks under three headings: adnominal, nominal and adjunct.\footnote{Sections 4.61, 4.62 and 4.63 thus roughly correspond to the tasks of adjectives, nouns and adverbs. The term ‘adjunct’ has a wider sense than ‘adverbial’, since adjuncts and adjunct constructions can qualify not only verbs but also whole clauses.}

All loose forms of juncture are dealt with in section 4.8.
4.61. Clauses in adnominal tasks

Old Turkic has basically three different types of attributive relative constructions: left-branching constructions built around participles, right branching ones that are introduced by particles, and relativisation which makes use of correlative pronouns, where the head can be within the relative clause. The first type, here called synthetical, is described in section 4.611, the second, which we call analytical, in section 4.612. Correlative relativisation is described in section 4.65. The heads which relative clauses qualify refer to constituents (action participants or circumstantial) of these as well as being constituents in the matrix clause; this is why they get deleted from both synthetical and analytical relative clauses: They do not, however, get deleted from the subordinate clauses within the correlative relativisation construction. Finally we have headless relatives (dealt with in section 4.62 with subsections) themselves referring to such participants or circumstantial.

Sometimes the qualifier clause denotes the action as a whole and not one of its participants; in this case it is not a relative clause. When the head is not a participant in the action described by the subordinated verb, nothing gets deleted even though the subordination is effected by synthetical means. Two such simple examples are ölürmek sakincin (TT IV A 29) ‘with the intention of killing’ and bo nom bitimiş buyan adgi kilinc ‘this meritorious deed (consisting of) having had the sûra written down’, which show an infinitive and an action nominal in -mlis.

In the first of these the action is not meant to be linked to any particular subject; in the second the subject of bitit is the person who commissioned the copyist’s work. In the first case, ‘killing’ is the content of the thought which the word ölürmek qualifies, whereas, in the second instance quoted, the ‘having written something’ gets defined as punya (= buyan = adgi kilinc) or the source of punya. Such verbal nominals can also be accompanied by reference to the subject, which is in the nominative in the following instances (both with -mâk forms): bokin [ki] kinkâ tâgi mogücülar otça yapmak tîltâgî bo ârûr ‘this is the reason for the Magi’s worshiping of fire to this day’ (U I 9) or cinâk keginç bermâkî nom ‘the text of Chandaka’s answering’ (a book title in ChrManMsFr 1208). In the following expression, reference to the subject of the subordinated perfect participle can be found in the possessive suffix added to the head of the construction: anaka ataka yazmişnîg ayig kilinçkârimiznî (BT XIII 12.76) ‘our evil deeds (consisting of) having sinned towards mother and father’; unlike
the other examples I have come across, the satellite is linked to the head by the genitive. For the content cf. čæ̞şapäš simiš tankari̇g i̇di̇si̇ yazoklarımı̇ ‘my sins of having broken precepts and having relinquished vows’ (1.46 in the text edited by M. Ölmek in Laut & Ölmek 1998: 267). In anı̇ti̇ kö̊n̄ul̄i̇n̄i̇dä̇kî n̄ä̂ busūşi̇n̄ sākın̄i̇n̄ i̇r̄s̄är m̄ı̇ni̇ kö̊r̄mi̇s̄ s̄ǟv̄ın̄ç̄k̄ā i̇r̄ak tarkargîš (TT X 136) ‘Get rid of any sorrow or worry there is in your heart through the joy of having seen me’ the subject of mini kö̊r̄mi̇s̄ (the satellite) is inherited from the main verb, a 2nd person imperative. In TT X 520-521 the reference is explicit in the anaphoric use of the genitive form anı̇ti̇ which also qualifies the head: anı̇ti̇ oğrâ ažūn̄akî ... tâ̄r̄ı̇ har̄̄ı̄x̄an nomi̇n̄i̇ aşı̄di̇miš ti̇f̄āmi̇s̄ oğrâti̇gi̇ üç̄a bo šlok nom kö̊n̄ul̄i̇n̄i̇dä̇ kâltî ‘Through his experience (öğrâti̇gî) in a previous existence of ... having heard and having listened to (aşı̄di̇miš ti̇f̄āmi̇s̄) the teaching of the divine Buddha, the following doctrinal verse came to his mind’: yarokîn bizi̇kãrî kâltûrdî i̇r̄s̄är, bı̄z̄ adrōk ētip yarātî̇p nomka kigûrsûg tûrû̄ bar ârîtî (Xw 167) ‘There was the rule that, whenever he conveyed his light to us, we (in turn) were supposed to prepare and organize it each in its special way and to introduce it to religion’ is an instance where the verbal noun kigûrsûg (< kigûr- ‘to introduce’) is accompanied by a nominative subject, bı̄z̄. In âvı̄rtgâlı̇ oti̇nmiš ötı̄gî̄n̄ā (BT II 114) ‘upon the request of ... to have (the punya) deflected’ the head and the qualifying verbal form happen to be etymologically related; English request is able to govern a phrase such as to have it translated but in Old Turkic ötı̄g had to be qualified by oti̇nmiš, a form less nounier than request to govern the supine in -gAlî̇.

In sǣnî̄r ti̇pî̄nî̄tâ ulug sāš ās̄ [a bur̄̄ı̄x̄an ol̄ūr̄ū yārî̄kami̇s̄ i̇z̄ ol (HTs III 974) ‘On a large rock at the foot of a promontory there is (ol) the mark of Buddha having sat there’, i̇z̄ ‘trace’ is not a participant or a circumstantial of the action of Buddha’s sitting but its result. I am not aware that ‘result’ can be expressed as a circumstantial in Old Turkic; if that were possible, this particular -mlî̇s̄ clause would also be a relative clause. I take this to be the criterion distinguishing between relativisation and qualification by clauses referring to the action as such, in any case holding for the instances mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Synthetical relative clauses precede their head while analytical relative clauses follow it. In the following example there is, exceptionally, a right-branching synthetical relative clause (with sözlädä̇ci̇ ‘pronouncing’ and tudà̄ci̇ ‘upholding’): kim kayu tǖni̇l̄ı̇ḡlar, bo šı̄dok darı̄ namūş sözlädä̇ci̇ tudâ̄ci̇, oğüz lârdâ kollârdâ ulug tuluy oğûz ičî̄nâ suva kârî̄p yunsârklar, ... (DhâSü 28) ‘If any creatures reciting and upholding this holy incantation get into rivers, into lakes
or into the sea and wash, ...’. This instance can also be considered an apposition. In the following sentence there is an analytical relative clause introduced by *kim* and following its head: *bar mu ařki antag tïnïlïglïr kim bo nom ſÆÆÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅåtš kä ÝÅÉ6ʾËÌÍ*Î (Suv 2,16, the introduction) ‘I wonder whether there are such creatures as attain good results (i.e. achieve their goals) right here in this visible world because of this sâra jewel’. What is here being relativised is not a finite verb as generally in analytical relative clauses, but a participle without a copula. This is also rather rare but not as rare as right-branching participles without *kim*. It may not be a coincidence that the forms in both passages are participles, as there may have been some reminiscence of *-dA|I* in finite use, as in Orkhon Turkic.

### 4.6.11. Synthetical relative clauses

Old Turkic relative clauses are usually built around participles. However, *ärgürmiš kïzïl bakïr i* (BT II 468) `the hell where they give (people) red-hot melted copper to drink’ is a synthetical relative construction although one would not call the *-mAk+lxg* form (discussed in OTWF pp. 153-5) a participle. Relative clauses qualify nominals referring to one of the entities involved in the event being described (in the instance just quoted, e.g., the entity is ‘place’). We can thus classify them according to the task of the head nominal in this event.

1) Orkhon Turkic examples for relative clauses qualifying the relativised verb’s subject are *körür közüm* ‘my seeing eyes’ (KT N 10), *igïdniš xagaṇï* (KT S9) ‘the ruler who has taken care of you’, *öläci boðun* ‘the people who were going to perish’ (KT E29). Further, Uygur *täprämäz kamïšamaz ormaglari oronlarï* (BT V 189) ‘their immobile and unshaking abode’ and *sävär in üçgïmiš mïn känçimïn, sävär amrak atayïmïn* (Suv 626, 16-17) ‘I have lost my baby, my dear loving chick!’ One would not say that *seeing* in English *my seeing eyes* is a relative clause, though *which see in eyes which see* would qualify as one. Our practice concerning Turkic is to call any attributive participle a relative clause, since the distinction between these and even elaborate relativizations is gradual and fuzzy. In *bir bilgä nom bilir är* (KP 14,3) ‘a wise man who knew the doctrine’ the participle has the object *nom* but the bracketing could also be (*nom bil*-)-*ir*. With *-yOk* we have e.g. *övkä köŋül örïtnïyök tïnïlg* ,a creature which never

---

622 This is how we *have* to translate *bilir* in this sentence and *öläci* in the previous one, since the main verbs are in the past tense.
let itself get into an angry frame of mind’ (U III 42,13); cf. the common phrase kömü öri-.. In üç yak savın sımağlı ... tars azag nomlaglar (M III nr.12 r3) ‘the … propounders of heretic doctrines, who do not contradict the words of the three demons’, the -(X)glI participle is negated. ol törätä yigilmış nacı kişilär öri örsär ‘All the people who were assembled at that ceremony …’ (Suv 5,8-9) has a relative clause with -mlš qualifying its subject.

2) In yagı alkımıš yula (Mait 103v11) ‘a beacon whose oil has been consumed’ and közi körmäz kişi (MaitH XV 8r25) ‘a person whose eyes do not see’ the possessive suffix added to yag ‘oil’ and to köz ‘eye’, the subjects of the relativised verbs, refers to the heads, showing that they (i.e. yag and köz respectively) in some way or another ‘belong’ to these heads (yula and kişi respectively): These are examples for the bahuvr śi construction with participles in the adnominal predication. The eye is, of course, an inalienable part of a person’s body, and oil was a necessary and commonly known ingredient of oil lamps.

3) Participles can also be used for relativization when heads are direct objects. In the following two clauses, the subject türk bodun is supplied both from the matrix clause and from the possessive suffixes added to the heads: türk bodun ellädök elin iğinü idmīš, xaganladok xaganın yetürü idmīš ‘the Türk nation let their realm, which they had created, slip away, and lost their emperor, whom they had crowned’ (KTE 6).

When the relative clause is to refer to 1st and 2nd person subjects of the relativised verb, the reference is normally effected by a possessive suffix on the head, e.g. in aydok isayaz(i)n tükäti islädmäz (M I 10,13) ‘we have fully carried out the task you told us to do’. In künkä ašadokumuz beš tängi yarok ‘the light of the fivefold god which we absorb during the day’ (Xw 201) however, the subject appears as a possessive suffix on the verb form.

Rarely, early sources use -mlš forms also for perfect relativisation: ačümüz apamız tutmīš yer suv (KTE 19) ‘the territory which our ancestors ruled’. In Manichean sources this happens only when there is to be no explicit reference to the subject: etmīš yaratmīš tatiglī aš ‘a well-prepared and tasteful meal’ (runiform ms. TM 342 I r4-5, Köktürf 1056); sızlärdā almīš agu xormuzta t(äu)rīkā agay mjaŋ] (M I 19,15) ‘I will shoot the poison taken from you at the god Ohrmizd’. In sızlamäsig irincülük söz ‘a loathsome expression not to be uttered’ (Xw 198) the head is also the direct object of the verb; here
the meaning is not factive but prescriptive, since -sXg is a projection participle. The subject of sözlä- not being retrievable from the context, we take it that the ‘utterance’ should not, according to the speaker, be uttered by anybody. In the previous sentence, the poison could have been taken (al-) by the subject / speaker or by an assistant.

Buddhist Uygur uses -miš for perfect relativisation also with subject. In the following example the subject marking is on the head (as in the -dOk instance quoted from M I 10,13 above): mäniATURES Koliš kut+um bütmäčän ‘May the blessing for which I prayed not materialize (if ...)’ (T II S 21 a = U 261 v5, a Buddhist fragment with Manichaean punctuation quoted in the n. to BT V 426; there mistranslated). This is presumably in analogy to cases such as mäniigue ašnuki ažunta kőlmiš öz kőltiš+im (TT VI 15) ‘my own deed which I committed in a previous life’, where the deed or sin is the subject’s sin. Cf. also täprü tavygač [elign]nish yaraminiš swösîn (HTs VII 18) ‘(He read out) the preface which the divine Chinese emperor had composed’; the emperor is the author, i.e. the subject of yarat-, but one could also say that the preface was ‘his’ preface. In bo ogul sutmakniš bermiš ašün yep aymiš išin kőliš ... (SammlUigKontr Ad3.6) ‘This son (should) eat the food which S. gives (him) and carry out the work which he tells (him to do)’; on the other hand, the food and work are Sutmak’s, in another sense the boy’s.623 When subjects are in the nominative the head does not necessarily have the possessive suffix: täprü tägrisi burxan yarlıkašt miš ... idok darni (TT VI 02), a holy formula decreed by Buddha the god of gods’. There are cases, finally, when the head has no possessive suffix even when the subject is in the genitive case: ol kőńki bizni ašda olırtgići ut köyn töme bəşlap tıńlife (Suv 6,13) ‘creatures, mainly bovines, sheep and pork, which we had intended to slaughter that day at our meal’; braman burxanlarning yarlıkašt birt slok nomuşt aça yada sözłašdi (U III 36,1) ‘The brahman recited and interpreted the didactic poem which the Buddhas had decreed’.

4) In ayamçaň körnülin yükûngû ... kańiš mani burxan (Pothi 2) ‘my father the prophet Mani, to be worshipped with reverence’ the head is the indirect object of the verb yükün-.

5) ni(i)goşaklarning suyin yazokin öküngü xwastwani(ï)yt (Xw 221, ms. B) ‘The Xw. (with) which the auditors are to repent their sins’; uzlangu ād (M I 17i) ‘the material to carry out one’s craft’ or

623 Note that reference to the subject of the sentence is deleted from the two relative clauses, where there is zero reference to the indirect object.
al paddurgu sakînê ‘meditation by which to weaken (bad influences)’ are instances of relative forms used for qualifying kernels which refer to their instrument. bo kîşiên ātōzin yumîš suv (Dhâşû 31) signifying ‘the water (with) which this person washed his body’, the head suv is the instrument of washing (yu-) and not its subject; the person referred to as bo kîşi is the subject of the superordinate clause.

6) The head is often the place where the action or event described by the adnominal clause takes place. In inscriptional el tutsuk yer ‘the place to rule the realm from’ (KT S 4), Manichaean bo tugar ölüür yertîncü yersuv ‘this world in which one gets born and dies’ (M 126 + M 502m + M 201 quoted in the note to BT V 217) or Buddhist ölüg kâmişgülük ... [âyîg oron ol (HTs III 721)’ It is a bad (?) place, (used) for deposing corpses’ there is no explicit subject, though one might consider the rulers of the Türk empire to be the implicit subject in the first example, In ötrö olormîş oronînîn örü turup ... ‘Then he stood up from the seat he had been sitting on, and ...’ (TT VI 011) and kântü öznü• oronîn kötürü turur (BT VII B44) ‘he keeps lifting the seat on which he is himself sitting’ there is reference to the subject in the possessive suffix added to the head. ymä zruš• [burxan] ârtöki yerdä ‘at the place where Zarathustra stayed’ (ManUigFr p. 401, 10), on the other hand, has an explicit nominal subject in the nominative; the pronominal reference to this subject is on the verb and not on the head (cf. the expression quoted under (3) from Xw 201). [ana]nt arxant ... ötrö olormîş orontîn turup ... (HTs III 678) ‘The arhat Ānanda ... then got up from where he had been sitting and ...’ is very similar to the TT VI and BT VII passages just quoted, but shows no anaphoric reference to the subject (Ānanda) either on the -mîş form or on the head, as appears to be usual with local heads. In runiform inscriptions the possessive suffix is wholly absent when the reference exists but is made superfluous by the context: sanêdok yer ‘the place where (we) routed (them)’ (ȘU W7); with a 2nd person subject, bardok yerdä ‘in the places where (you) went’ (KT E24 = BQ E20); tâģri yarlîkadi, yańdimiţ ... yańdok yolta ymä öltî kök (Tuñ I S9) ‘God ordered (so, and) we dispersed (them) ... those whom (we) dispersed died right on the road’.

7) In yanmas yerdä oztumuz (M III nr.16 v3) ‘We escaped the place of no return’ the head is the source of the activity described by the verb, the place from which no creatures come back. tugmîş atamîţ (BT XIII 5,7-8) ‘our real father’ literally signifies ‘the father from whom we
were born': The father is the source of the event (unless one wants to reduce fathers’ task at reproduction to instrumental function).

8) In ozgu kutulgu yol (Pothi 63) ‘the way to salvation’, t(ä)ŋrijä yerinjä bargu ... yol (Pothi 72) ‘the way by which to go to the land of gods’ and bošungu yol agüngu šatu (M III nr.1 IV v14-15) ‘the way to freedom and the ladder for rising’ the head is the way by which one reaches a certain destination; this is in Old Turkic generally expressed by the equative.

9) The head can refer to the time of the event; with perfect participle: ıdok elig uluşug ağır başıp oronka olormiş tokuz yegirmenç yilinta (DKPAMPb 29-30) ‘in the 19th year of his having subdued the divine nation and country (el uluş) and of having acceded the throne.’ With imperfect participle: yilim yašım adırlığ bilmäüz üdtdä (HTs VII 331) ‘at a time when my age was one in which I did not perceive matters clearly’. The necessitative -gU and -gUIXk forms qualify terms referring to projected time; e.g. yula tamturgu künlär (TT VII 40,112) ‘the days on which one is to light a torch’ or amți maŋa burxan kuţın bulguluk üd yıagumış ārür ‘Now the time has come near for me to attain Buddhahood’ or ‘the time when I should attain Buddhahood is near’. In bodisavtnıŋ taloy őğüz ićintä ingülük üçintä kizçüd üdtdä ‘in the third watch, during which the bodhisattva is to descend into the ocean’ (MaitH XV 6r24), the subject appears with the genitive suffix, not taken up by any 3rd person possessive suffix (the Mait is one of the earliest Buddhist Uygur texts). In the following example in which -gUIXk again qualifies üd, reference to the subject is handled in still another way: İn ol tünliŋlar kälgiľük üdintä ‘at the time when those creatures were expected to come’ (Suv 19,19) the subject is referred to both by a nominal phrase in the nominative and by the possessive suffix on the head.

In some of the examples quoted, the ‘possessive’ suffixes added to the heads may be either possessive or agentive. In aydok isäŋäţ ‘the task you told us to do’, mäniŋ kolmiš kutum ‘the blessing for which I prayed’, ol tünliŋlar kälgiľük üdintä ‘at the time when those creatures were expected to come’, oronka olormiş tokuz yegirminç yilinta ‘in the 19th year of his having acceded the throne’ or tirilmiş tiltagım (Suv 5,8) ‘the explanation for my resurrection’ reference to the subject is effected by possessive suffixes on the head. In künkä ašadokunuz beš tāŋrä yarokž ‘the light of the fivefold god which we absorb during the day’ and zrušt [burxan] ärtokį yer ‘the place where Zarathustra
When an adnominal construction has a projection participle as kernel, it can express necessity. With -gU: yula tamturgu künlar (TT VII 40,112), e.g., is ‘the days on which one is to light a torch’. Similarly with the -sXk / -sXg form in sözlömüş irinciildig söz ‘a loathsome expression not to be uttered’ in Xw 198 or in el tutsuk yer ‘the place to govern (from)’ in KT S 4. There is no reference to any particular subject in these examples; the utterance is meant to refer to any.

There could possibly be nominal, i.e. verbless left-branching relative clauses. One border instance is kumcuylar taysilar baslaguchi [ul]ug kiçig kam(a)g bodun (TT II,1 64) ‘the whole nation, both big and small, (with) princesses and princes as (their) leaders’: The -gUcf form is not a participle but a deverbal noun, which does, however, govern direct objects (see section 3.113); to translate the relative clause as ‘led by princesses and princes’ would therefore be less correct. Still, if the nominal clause in adnominal position had had a purely nominal (i.e. not deverbal) predicate, the bahaurihi construction (discussed in section 4.122) would have been used instead. The attributes bö+kuin bar and yaran yok in bö+kin bar yaran yok büktsiz mâqusuz ât’öz ‘the fickle and transient body which is here today and gone tomorrow’ (r12 in a Mait colophon edited by Laut in Ölmez & Raschmann 2002: 133) are like verbless relative clauses in consisting, respectively, of the deleted subject ât’öz of temporal adjuncts and of the predicates bar ‘existent’ and yok ‘non-existent’.

4.612. Analytical relative clauses
Post-inscriptinal Old Turkic has an additional, right-branching relativisation strategy, using the particle kim (rarely kayu).

1) In most cases the head of the relativisation serves as subject in the subordinate clause. In the following Christian instance both relative clauses are adjacent to their heads, the first instance preceding the
direct object: oxšayur sän ... ol ingäkkä kim īraktän īntädi öz buzagusitàga kim azıp barmiš ārdi (ChrManMsFr ChrFr r 12-14) ‘You resemble that cow which called from afar to her own calf, which had gone astray’. The instances ot kim īgač ëkan üntüp y(e)nä īgač ëg ortäyür ... kisgäč kim kääntä ol ok tāmirän etilmä ol ... tonnuğ biti kim kisınäğ tärıştäntä üntüp y(e)nä kisınäğ kāntä sörar ‘fire which emanates from wood and again burns wood ... tongs, which are themselves made of iron ... the louse of clothing which comes out of people’s skin and again itself sucks a person’s blood’ are found in one Manichæan source in M I 7-8. Further such kim clauses appear in ManUigFr r1, DreiPrinz 91-2 and 111 and M III nr.7 III r11-12. In the following Manichæan sentence (M III nr.6 II r3) both the synthetic and the analytical relative clauses appear inside the main clause: ol ašanmiš aš kim ol āt özintä kirür ölür ‘The eaten food which enters that body dies’. There is another such instance in M III nr.7 I v9-10. Reference to the antecedent need not get deleted when the relative clause is nominal; the postposed ol here refers back to ‘place’: alkatmiš yer kim kamag tä ... kpraräz kamš amaz oronlarï ol (BT V 188) ‘the blessed place which is the strong and solid, immobile and unshaking abode of all the gods’. In the following sentence kayu ‘which’ is used as relative pronoun, the head consisting of a binome of participles used nominally: kim ārdi ārdi bo bütin yertinçä yer suvdäkä alku alplarïm täyegäd miš kayu bo yavlak sakìnçäğ yäkniñ pavanïnta korkänçäz kirip kälät (TT X 253) ‘Who might have been the one who overcame all the heroes in this world, who fearlessly entered the bedroom of this evil-thinking demon?’ The reason for the use of kayu in this sentence may possibly have been the fact that it starts with interrogative kim, and the writer felt that the relative particle might have been mistaken for that.

There is a construction with yok ‘there isn’t’ in which the verb appears in the conditional form: tñlint owlant yok kim mäniñ ogilm känjim ... bolnmädi ārsär (MattH X 2r1) ‘(In the whole of Samsāra) there are no humans unless they be such as became my mother, father ...’, i.e., to put it more simply, all human beings became my mother or my father (in one of their previous existences). Similarly bo yer üzä näy andeg třäv kür välvı arvış yok kim ol umasar (M II 5.10) ‘There is no such trick or magic or incantation as he would not be capable of’: anta adîn tñlint yok kim mäniñ türömäkäki sçlärïg tutgalï usar (U IV A 184-6) ‘There is no creature other than that one which would be capable of getting hold of the hairs on my head’. Another example appears in TT IV A 23-24 and additional ones are quoted further on in this section.
In the following Manichæan example (M I 17,8), as well as in Suv 610,17 or 616,3-5, the relative clause is not adjacent to its head but follows the complete main clause; this would be impossible with participial relativisation: *ol azîn kim taštan âska iclekâ katlap ârûr ... îôrâki az birlâ katalur, kim erkâkî tišîli at'özîntâ ârûr* ‘That lust of yours, which is mixed with external food and drink, ... gets mixed with internal lust, which is present in male and female bodies’. Similarly in TT VI 253, ôtrô bo yertîncûdâki ulušîn balîkîn etû berûrlâr, kim ayîg kîlîncîlg ... tîntîlgarîg yîr basar ‘Then they (i.e. the rulers, who are in fact bodhisattvas) organize their state in this world, which suppresses evil-doing and ... persons’, and BT V 175, tàgri kirîkînlarîn tàgri olgulanlarîn alkamiš törümtîş ol, kim ol orgînnîng özîn tåg ortosîn tåg ... bolup tuturlar ‘He has created the divine maidens and divine youths, who have become as the heart and center ... of that throne’.

ögi kañî antag ögäk sav sôzlâyû umagay kim ol ârûg köñlin yarotsar (M I 15,3) ‘His parents will not be able to say any such considerate words as might brighten up that man’s soul’ is another (Manichæan) example where the relative clause is not adjacent to the head. The subordinated verb is not an aorist, as in the examples quoted in the previous paragraph; it is a conditional form, as in the paragraph before that, where the main clause has the element *yok*: The meaning of the main clause is here similar to that, since what is here denoted is the absence of ‘loving words’. This subordinate clause can also be understood as consecutive (section 4.637), then to be translated as ‘... words so considerate that they could brighten ... ’; the translation in Doerfer 1993: 34 is unacceptable.

2) In the examples discussed under 1) the *kim* clause is used for subject qualification. In the following example, however, the head (*ûdgû*) is the indirect object of the relativised verb (*tàgmâ- ‘not to attain’): *tàgri tàgribi bûrxannîng âdgû oglî köfîli tàgmiš işi küdûgî uzâ yok antag âdgû kim tàgmâgilûk* (HtsPar 14 r22) ‘Through the activity reached by the benevolence of Buddha the god of gods, there is no such good as one cannot expect to attain.’ Note that here, as in the last example mentioned, the antecedent is qualified by *antag ‘such’; unlike that instance, however, this subordinate clause cannot be understood as having consecutive meaning. Thus also in the following instance, in ms. T I D 200 I.18.\textsuperscript{624} *näg antag yer yok kim luşyanta özî tolu yok ârsîr*

\textsuperscript{624} Quoted in the n. to TT V A 23. This is an early text, as it has twice *kanyu+garu* where later texts have *kayu*, twice the -(X)gll/ participle and *izl/ is in some cases spelled with two dots.
‘there is no such place that L. himself should be wholly absent (from it)’. In this case the head is the place for which the content of the relative clause is said to hold; other examples of yok + relative clauses with the -sAr form have already been mentioned.

In öğ sakân ol ozakî sav yörüglarín kim mân sîzlärkä ayu bertim (M III nr.7III, 15,11)  ‘Remember and think about those previous explanations of matters which I was so nice to tell you’ the yörüglär are direct object both of ö- sakân- in the main clause and ay- in the relative clause. In Windg + U 132c 16-18, another Manichaean source, the head also serves as direct object of the verb (tep okiyeurlar) in the relative clause: yîl sayu ol ay bâlgülûg ârîr kim i igaçî camastigî ... yeltîrây ay tep okiyeurlar ‘Every year there appears that month which they call the windy month (lit. ‘the month in which the wind blows, yeltîr-’), which shakes and ...-es the bushes and trees’. In Windg + U 132c 40, the head isig suvug appears in the accusative, the case form which it would have if it were part of the relative clause, and not the nominative, corresponding to its task in the matrix clause: inêa kalî isig suvug, kim tumîlîg suvka katsar, ötrö icigilik yaraşi sîviglik bolur ‘just as warm water, which one adds to cold water, becomes agreeable to the drinking (person)’. A perhaps late note on the reverse of a Sogdian ms. reads bo bitîg ârîr el körmišûg bitîg ârîr kim m(a)n kiz cun ali(t)im ‘As for this text, it is the text of El Körmiš which I, K. Ç., have received’; this instance also has the relative clause qualify the direct object of the relativised verb. In Qarakhanid bo söz kim sîn aydîn bagîrsakîlîg ol ‘The words you uttered are compassionate’ (QB 3335) the head is also the direct object while, in bo kîn mâkim âdgı atansa kîsi ‘and (mâ) this day (on which) a good person may be nominated’ (QB 253, again with a conditional) the head has time reference.

The head of the following instance refers to the father of the direct object (kiz+în) in the relative clause: òz kadînî yerîgî tægî, kim kaqî xan kîzîn âdgıi nîgli tegînkâ kolmîs ærî (KP 64,3) ‘He came to the place of his own father-in-law, whose daughter his own father had asked (in marriage) for the Good-Wishing Prince’. The exact relationship

625 Cf. l.48 in the same text: inêa kalî tumîlîg suv, kim isig suvka katsar sogîtr ‘just as cold water which, when one adds it to warm water, cools (it)’ (translated rather freely by the editor). Alternately, kim may have been introduced in analogy to other sentences in the context; without it, the clause signifies ‘just as, when one adds warm water to cold water, it becomes agreeable ...’

626 Zieme in a review by Sundermann in SBOAS 40(1977):635, reviewing a text collection by McKenzie. Zieme says that the note is late because the second bitîg appears without possessive suffix; that phenomenon is discussed in section 4.121.
between the two clauses is made clear by the possessive suffix in kïzïn.

In antag bar kim ol țînlîq örtkä örtänmâz (TT VI 114-5) ‘There is such a thing that that creature is not burned by fire’, finally, the main clause is an instance of the existential construction. The subordinate clause qualifies the pronoun antag ‘such a one’ inasmuch as pronouns can get qualified by relative clauses; one could perhaps also consider the kim clause to be used in apposition. The similarity of the TT VI 114-5 sentence with the following two, both from other early texts, may be superficial if I understand it correctly: ... önjîrârî kîlîrdîlîr. y[mâ] antag bar ârtî kim âlî, ymâ antag bar ârtî kim berî (DreiPrinz 115-6) ‘they brought (the presents) before him. There were such that he took and such that he gave’; ymâ antag bar âdğî ôgli ol; antag bar nomug taplağî kîşîlîr (M III Nr.6 Iv11) ‘So there are people who are compassionate and there are people who advocate the (true) doctrine’.

By content, sentences like ol tängrî urîsî ... tavranu kayütîn sîngar tängrîlîr elîgî xormuzta tängrî ârsâr, antîn sîngar yakîn barîp ... (U II 29, 19-21) ‘that divine boy hurriedly went into the direction in which the god Indra, the king of kings was’, described in section 4.65, contain relative clauses as well, but they use the correlative strategy.

Analytical causal (section 4.635) and consecutive (section 4.637) clauses also get introduced by kim, and there are cases (e.g. one in M I 28,21) where relative and causal or consecutive interpretations are both possible; I take causal and consecutive kim to come from relative kim, in that the implicit motive for introducing relative clauses is often that they justify the content of the main clause.

The particle kim, absent from Orkhon Turkic, might come from the interrogative-indefinite pronoun kâm, kimni etc., whose nominative has the shape kim in Uygur. In the following sentence, both a particle and a pronoun reading would be possible, which might show us how the word for ‘who’ might have come to be used for this purpose: tûn sayu ... montag sakinê kîlsar, alku tînlîgîl bo dyan sakînêlîq kîshîg kim körîsîr, buxanîg körîsî tâq săvîr taplayur ayayur âgiîlayurlar (TT V A 113) ‘If he meditates in this way every night, all creatures, whoever sees (or, with kim as relative particle, ‘all creatures who see’) this meditating person, will love, appreciate and honour (him) as if they

---

627 Note that the ‘daughter’ has to precede the ‘prince’s father’ in the English translation but not in its Uygur counterpart.

628 There is a king both among the guests and among the hosts, so that an exchange of presents would be normal.
had seen Buddha’. In the first reading the subordinate clause stands in apposition; in the second this is a case of the correlative constructions described in section 4.65. Note that the element kim is not at the beginning of the clause it serves, since the object bo dyan sakîn êšîg kîšî+g precedes it. If this etymology is correct, kim might originally have been used exclusively for human antecedents. The idea that the particle kim comes from kim ‘who’ gets support from the instance in which kayu ‘which’ is used for relativisation (quoted under (1) above from TT X), as this is also an interrogative-indefinite pronoun. Note that the scope of English relative which for antecedents is also narrower that its scope as interrogative pronoun.

4.62. Complement clauses

In Uygur there are different strategies for putting clauses into participant tasks of matrix sentences. Most Old Turkic clauses serving as nominals in participant tasks are headless relative clauses. We will, in what follows, classify headless relative clauses as well as infinitive constructions by the case tasks they fill in the matrix sentence, then make a sub-classification by the function which they have with respect to the subordinated action. Rarely, interrogative-indefinite pronouns are used as heads for such clauses or as relative pronouns, resulting in structures similar to English: nā ädgî kîlinê kîlmišên629 maña nomlay (Aranemî 1 a r 9) ‘Tell (deferential) me what good deeds he carried out’. This differs in content from both *kîlmiš ädgî kîlinê in maña nomlay ‘Tell me the good deeds that he carried out’ (the structure described below in this section) and nā ädgî kîlinê kîlmiš ürsür (anî) maña nomlay ‘Tell me whatever good deeds he carried out’ (the correlative construction expressing a generalising type of relativisation, section 4.65). The subordinate clause in the Aranemî-jîatak serves the object of kil- and serves as object of the main clause. In what follows the subordinate clause represents the object of sakîn- but serves as subject of the main clause, i.e. it refers to the objects of the thought of the person serving as subject to the main clause: nā könûlîntê sakînmîshi alku könlinçä bolur (TT VI 108-9) ‘What he thought in his heart will all materialize according to his wishes’. In nûcâ yaš yašanîşên öyür ‘He remembers how many years he lived’ (MaitH XV 2r4) nûcâ yaš serves as object of yaša- and the subordinate clause as a whole serves as object in the main clause. More commonly, Old Turkic relative pronouns demand the -sAr form (section 4.65).

629 The editor writes kilmišê but the facs. seems to be clear enough.
Subject and object clauses are the most common types of complement clauses, dealt with in sections 4.621 and 4.622 respectively. Here we will mention a few rarer types, representing an indirect object, an instigator (both in the dative case) and a predicate nominal (in the nominative).

Headless relative clauses serving as indirect objects are put into the dative case (of the verb inan- in the following sentence): inanur biz kapıgınına kün tâyri ornamışka (HTs VII 1238) ‘We believe in him at whose gate the sun has installed itself’. In tâyriçi män nomci män tegmâkâ artizip ... (Xw) ‘letting oneself get deceived by somebody who says ‘I represent God, I am a preacher’’ te-gmā (imperfect -(X)gmA participle of te- ‘to say’) serves as subject of the subordinate clause and, at the same time, as instigator for the superordinated verb artiz-. The instigator status, in Old Turkic also signalled by the dative case, cannot be equated either with subject or with object (see section 4.5); it should not be considered an adjunct either, as the instigator is a real participator in the event.

The status of the predicative participle should also be clearly distinguished from that of subject: In savî yarligi yorîgan bolur (Schwitz 17) ‘He becomes one whose words and orders prevail’ there is zero reference to the subject, and savî yarligi yorîgan is predicative. Note that the form yorî-gan is accompanied by its subjects, sav+î ‘his word’ and yarlig+i ‘his command’, which are linked to the topic by the possessive suffixes.

4.621. Subject clauses
Headless relative clauses can be subjects either of verbal sentences or of nominal ones. In the first, second, fourth and fifth examples to be quoted, e.g., they are subjects of nominal sentences, while they are the subjects of verbal sentences in the third and sixth examples.

The verb form representing the subject of the subordinate clause, with the imperfect or the perfect participle; the subject clause is left-dislocated in the first example, pushed to final position by the wh° form in the second one: bo montag körksüz yatagma nā törlûg kişi bo ‘This (person) lying there in such an ugly way, what sort of a person is he?’ (ManErz I 6); kim ârdâ ârkı bo bütün yertincü yer savdakhı alku alplarîg utmiş yegâmix (TT X 253) ‘Who might have been the one who overcame all the heroes in the whole world?’

Then a few headless relatives whose verb form represents the action itself; first an infinitive: sizni sâvmâkimiz montag ol ‘This is how we love you’ (HTs VII 1880). With projection participles: tûn uðisîkim kâlmâdi, kûntüz olorsukum kâlmâdi ,I did not feel like sleeping at night
nor like resting during the day’ (Tuñ I S5); ötüğ tiläk bulgulukı sarp ‘It is difficult to obtain what one wishes’. With the aorist: bir ymnä ärrü yok ärip ‘nor is there any unity, and …’. With perfect participle (transferred to final position by interjectional interrogative): nä tusu bolur (or: bulur) ol ädgü kün, ol ädgü üd körmişi talulamişi (TT VI 23) ‘Of what use will it be (to him) that he looked for and found out a suitable day and a suitable hour?’ In it ürdöki kuş üni ... äštilmüz ‘No barking of dogs and no voice of birds is heard …’ (M III nr.32 r1) the action nominal is the subject of a passive verb.

The infinite verb forms refer to the direct object of the subordinated verb in ätüzin alku kayu kılımişlarım mandal mudur burxanlınyñ işi bolzon; tilin alku kenürüm sözlümüşlerim … darni nom packıkları bolzon; könüdin alku sağımmiş ömülässerim sakınmış yaruk yaşık mani bolzon (ls. 40-44 in baxši ögdisi, edited by M. Ölmez, Laut & Ölmez 1998: 267) ‘May all and any thing which I did (kil-) with my body become mandala, mudräm and the Buddhas’ business; may all I speak about (sözläm-) in detail become incantations and verses of teaching; may all I think of (sağım- ö-) in my heart become untroubled bright pearls’. A further example: sayväürtak temişi sudur vinay abidaram üç ağluk nomlar tetirär (MaitH Y 265) ‘The type they call (te-) sayvärti is considered to consist of the books of süura, vinaya, abhidharma and tripitaka’; the possessive suffix on temiş does not refer to the subject of te- (that not being referred to, hence left general, here rendered by ‘they’) but to the mention of sayvärtak in the previous sentence.

Headless relatives referring to objects appear more often to have been formed for the purpose of clefting, where they serve as topics: In ançuklayu ärür mänjä äsidişim (TT VI 05 and U II 28,3) ‘What I have heard is as follows’ the topic follows the comment; the non-clefted sentence would have been ‘ançuklayu äsidişim. We also have the -dOk form serving as topic, here with a (rhetorical) interrogative pronoun as comment: ogrü tep tedökişüz nágü ol (KP 59,5) ‘What is that which you call a thief?’ Somewhat similar to the first sentence is män kololadokum kamagda ärklig yultz ärmiş (1.5-9 in ms. TM 342630) ‘What I have discovered is that stars turn out to be the mightiest’. män is added for reference to the verb’s subject as contrast to the other two persons participating in the dispute, here in the nominative as against the genitive of the first sentence in this paragraph. The comment is itself a full sentence, the object of the verb kolola- (as the text which ançuklayu refers to is the object of äsiti- in that sentence). All three

---

sentences are nominal, but topic and comment are linked by copulas in the first, by *ol* in the second and by nothing in the runiform sentence, where the comment is itself a sentence.

The sentence *ançama ögmüş alkamiš töriä ärür, kim äsirkänčsiz köglön äd tavar bašši bermäk* (MaitH I 12r6) is difficult to analyse though its meaning is clear: ‘What a laudable behaviour it is to give away possessions unselfishly as charity!’ We have *kim* subordinating a non-finite verb form below, in the next paragraph; infinite verb forms are also found among the right-branching relative clauses described in section 4.612. Both *kim* clauses appear to be headless relatives serving as topics to the rest of the sentence, as does the headless relative introduced by *nä* in the previous paragraph.

Analytical headless relative clauses can also serve clefting. When the child *bodhisattva* Maitreyga says that all the alphabets he has been presented with are not suitable for the holy scriptures, his bewildered father asks (MaitH XI 15r10): *bo munca törlüg bitüglar užaklar užak sanıya kirmaz örsörler, kayu užak arki kim užak sanıya kırğıći ‘If all these different sorts of writings and alphabets are not to be considered as alphabets, what, then, are the alphabets which do enter into the category of alphabets?’ The structure of *kayu užak arki kim užak sanıya kırğıcı* is similar to *ogrı tep tedıküyüz nágü ol* just quoted, in that both are nominal sentences with an interrogative pronoun as one member and a headless relative clause as the other.

4.622. Object clauses

While subject clauses appear always to have an infinite verbal form as kernel, object clauses either have verbs or lack them. We will first deal with object clauses without verb, then with ones with verb.

With verbless object clauses either the subject or the predicate is put into the accusative case. The former happens in *Maxarit eläg ädgü oglı teginig bususlug körüp ...* (KP 4,3) ‘King M. saw that the well-meaning prince was sorrowful, and ...’ or in the second part of the following DLT proverb: *yilan kändü ägrisin bilmaz, teve boynıň äğri ter* ‘The snake does not know how bent it itself is and calls the camel’s neck ‘bent.’ Alternately, the predicate is in the accusative: *yer suv ärtimligin, ät‘öz ürlüksüzin ukütu ...* ‘explaining that the earth is transient and the body fickle’; *yer tarin uküdî* ‘He explained that the place was (too) small’ (HTs).

The sentences in the following passage are interesting because we know from the context that they are subordinated interrogatives, whence the translation with ‘whether’ and not ‘that’: *amranmak köğültärintä [...JArIntA ödrümişlärın, övkä biligsiz köğültüg*
bolmışların, övkä biligsiz biligdä önçi ödrümüşüp biligdä ö

y (MaitH XV 5v11-15) ‘He understands it all: whether they got rid of lechery, whether they acquired an angry and ignorant mentality (or) whether they got rid of anger and ignorance’. The suffix +lXg in könlügl in the second object clause of the following sentence can be translated with the verb ‘to have’: nizyanılag bolmışların nizyanıda önçi arığ turug bilgä könlüglärin adıra ukar (MaitH XV 5v17) ‘He understands exactly whether they have been marred by passion (or) whether they have wise pure hearts free from passion’. Being or not being angry and ignorant and being or not being passionate are disjunctions (although the way they are expressed does not give immediate insight into this fact), whereby the reader may have known that these are in fact subordinated interrogatives and not statements, but amranmak könlür ina ... ödrümüşüp is not a disjunction; this, then, is a matter we need more evidence for. In all these instances the subjects are referred to by possessive suffixes added to the predicate. Questions can be made objects of verbs of thinking also without incorporation by nominalization; in the following sentence the link is the forward reference of an and the quotative element tep following the unchanged question: an bilmädi, öyfräkäj övrgücikär užikin yöğün tüklä kütülär mu ärki tep (HTs VII 870-2) ‘He did not know whether previous translators had rendered text and meaning in their completeness’. The sentences with tep quoted below show a bit more incorporation, but see the constructions in section 4.7.

In all the verbless object clauses with predicate in the accusative case quoted above, their topics – yer suv, âtööz, and yer – were in the nominative. Topics of subordinated accusative predicates can also, however, be in the genitive form: yerinçinüng ürlaksizin bilmiş ukmiš k(a)rgäk (BT II 915) ‘One has to have realised that the world is fickle’; nomlärinüq öü tüşüzün tüzüüzün adırtläg bilirlär (Suv 386,7) ‘They know exactly that dharmas are without a real root or base’. A further such instance can be found in TT X 555-559.

There is a wide array of constructions in use when the object clause is verbal. One of these is for the verb of the subordinate clause to be made infinite; in a second type, the subordinate verb is left unchanged but its subject is put into the accusative. The connection can, thirdly, be left implicit.

1) Action nominals and infinitives are put into the accusative to serve as objects of verbs expressing thought, speech or writing; e.g. tegin alkunü taplamadı, tük taloy ögüzkä kirmişg tapladi (KP 15,3) ‘The prince didn’t like any (of the other ideas presented to him), he only
liked going out to the sea'. The reason for using the post-terminal -mlš form may be that the prince is not interested in the journey itself but only in its results. In this sentence, the subject of kir- is identical

with the subject of the main verb, tapla-. In the following three instances, the two subjects differ. The subject of such subordinated verbs is usually in the nominative: In bildi öyüşü tazanlar bilmeyoküg (HTs VIII 1919) ‘He knew what earlier āryas did not know’ the subordinate clause is a headless relative. Often the subordinate clause refers not to one of the participants but to the action / event as a whole: ol ụdun körđi Xerodes xan bo mogočlar yanıp adin öğி yolça barmişin (U I 9, Magier) ‘Then king Herod saw that the Magi had returned and gone by a different road’; buluğ yiğak üstün altın bulgambar tälğänmişin ukup ‘noting that the (world’s) four corners as well as (its) top and bottom are in confusion and disorder’ (AoF MaitH XV 1r11). Note that the -mlš form of the last two instances also bears a possessive suffix to refer to the subject. In the following example, however, we find the subject to be in the genitive: ečisiniğ kalmişin utgurak hilti (U III 86,18) ‘he was sure that his elder brother had arrived’. When the subject is in the genitive, the possessive suffix with the verb form is, of course, normal. TT X 518-519 has been read as tü[kál] bilgä t(ærí burxan-nığ çankramit k[i]lu yorimışin körđi ‘he saw the perfectly wise divine Buddha carrying out cankramita’. In the following object clauses the subjects of the subordinated verbs are in the accusative case: türri xaunları ymä kantı bgradable türriårığ taymişların körıp ... (Mait XVNachtr 4v29) ‘The goddesses, in turn, saw that their husbands the gods had slipped, and ...’; biz üçgü sizni ... kürğ üstözümünü ... idalagali külmişhiç[n] körüp (HTs III 451) ‘we three saw that you had made preparations for pointlessly giving up your body, ...’. türriårığ could, in principle, have been interpreted as a genitive, because /y/ is quite often spelled as K, but sizni can only be the accusative.

In nā törług aš ašamışın ... nāñi yaš yašamışın öýür ‘He remembers what sorts of food he ate, ... how many years he lived, ...’ (MaitH XV 2r4) the subject of the object clauses is, again, here and in the next example, the same as that of the main verb. nā törług aš and nāñi yaš are the verbs’ objects, nā and nāñi serving as relative pronouns. nāgū

631 kir- for this meaning is a calque on a Chinese expression, as shown by Hamilton in his note.

632 cankramita is a walking back and forth in meditation, whence the use of yorï. The editor thinks the stretch written NYX after burxan is an error for ɨg, taking this to be an accusative form; it must, however, be a genitive, the final nasal turning oral.
‘You explained to me what you did clearly and in detail’ is very similar, except that nägü serves as relative pronoun by itself.

Subject reference can also be taken care of through possessive suffixes appended to -dök: bo kargantokăn, alkantokăn, käňräštökän yöntüštökän bilmäz kïši tág sögüščä oyuncä sakamur, käntü ämä bilmäzlär ‘They consider this cursing and quarreling of theirs to be just scolding and play, like senseless people, and do not know it for what it is’ (MI 9.16-18); a letter (UigBrief A5) also has -dök+ as object: äsänin [ä]d[gün] ärdökän ešidip ‘hearing that he is well’. In the sentence bïltïmï[z] ukdumuz özümüzün üzïntümüzün üzä asra ýarokda ... tïnärigïdä ärtökin[ï] (M III nr.1 IV r9-13) ‘We have realised and understood that our selves and souls are above and below, in light and in dark’ the subject of the subordinated verb is in the accusative case; above we already met object clauses with -miš which had accusative subjects.

In kältökümün kertgünzün[lär], sziziň bägdämäkätïz(i)ñ [...] ärklänmäkïz(i)ñ bilzünl[ïr] (DreiPrinz 65-67) ‘let them be convinced of my having come and know of your rule and authority’ the infinitive is used in a construction identical with -dök+ and in parallelism with it. That the -dök+ form is factive seems to follow from the context of this sentence; so do the -mAk forms, apparently, since other instances using the infinitive in object clauses also appear to refer to factual circumstances: sïnmakïzm(ï)z büzulmakïzm(ï)znï tükätgäli umadïmï ‘We were unable to stop our heartbreaking’ (HTs VII 1916) with affixal pronominal reference to the subject and samtso aşarïnïn tavgäč xan birlâ kälïš bariš bitit idišmak ukîtmak ‘the account of the correspondence between Xuanzang and the Chinese emperor’ (HTs VII) with both affixal and nominal subject reference.

In the non-factive domain we have -Ar for the imperfective, the -sXk, -gU, and -gUlXk forms for projective predicates. An example with the -Ar participle is the following: bo yetä ağıštïz yetäčïlärïnï ažuninta tugärïn körüp ‘he saw that he (the divine boy) would be born in these 7 existences of eaters of impurities’ (UI 32.57). Orkhon Turkic uses -sXk as necessitative action nominal: yäñilik ölsükgïjun ... bunta urtum ‘I set down here (how) you will needs err and die (KT S 10); el tutsüküm bunta urtum ‘How you should govern people I have recorded here’ (tut-süküp here representing projected manner). Where Orkhon Turkic has -sXk, most of the rest of Old Turkic has -gU: maytri bodisavnïnï yertünęškä imp ... burxan kútïn bulgusïn ... ukar mu szï? ‘Do you ... understand that the bodhisattva Maitreya will come down
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to earth and attain Buddhadom?; Note that nominal subjects can here appear either in the nominative or in the genitive.

2) With indirect speech, Old Turkic also has a construction corresponding to the Latin ‘accusative + infinitive’: It puts the subject of a clause which is to serve as the object of a verb expressing thinking or speaking into the accusative case but leaves the subordinate verb finite; the subordination is effected by the quoting verb te-:

darmaguptakï atïg nomci açari baxšimizni kiïilti tép äsidip (HTs VII 1915) ‘(we) heard that our teacher, the master preacher named Dharmanuptaka died’; türk bodunuq ati küsi yok boylamun teyin (KT E 26) ‘saying about the Türk nation that its name and fame should not be destroyed’; 633 ol tïnlïgïg ... yanmaksïz âvrilmâksïz ãrïr tép bïlgülük ol (U II 39,100) ‘It should be known that there is no turning back for that creature’.

When verbless sentences are incorporated as object clauses, we find ellipsis of the topic: az teyin nâ basîña (Tuñ 39) ‘Why should we, thinking that (we are) few, be depressed?’ The direct speech sentence corresponding to this content would have been *(biz) az biz ‘We are few’. In section 4.7 we quote a verbless sentence serving as direct speech, also with biz as topic, where this topic is not omitted. The writer there has, however, added a reference to the topic in accusative case outside the specimen of direct speech, as we saw above with verbal object sentences.

In the following instances from an early text, the object sentence is marked as such by simply being placed between the subject and the predicate of the main clause; neither its subject nor its predicate are in the accusative but the 1st person which the woman would have used has been replaced by the 3rd person: kayu ïsilir kün tãyri karninta ñiir ñübsäär ... kayu ïsilir tülntâ ay tãyri graxlar bîrla karninta nñiir ñübs[ä]r634 ... kayu ïsilir tülntâ yigît urî yaçça mînîp k[ar]nînta ñiir ñül tül ñübsäär ... (MaitH XI 3r17-25) ‘If any woman dreams (that) the sun is entering her belly ... If any woman in her dream dreams (that) the moon together with the planets is entering her belly ... If any woman dreams a dream (that) a young male elephant is mounting (her) and entering her belly ...’. Next consider two object sentences which have

633 The parallel text in BQ E 20 has the stem form türk bodun instead of the accusative. Tekin 1968: 127 (and still Tekin 2003: 107) misunderstands the grammar here, giving this +Xg form as a (the only!) instance of a variant -ig of the genitive suffix.

634 This could also be an instance of haplology and not necessarily an error.
no mark of subordination at all, which are not classical instances of
direct speech (q.v. in section 4.7) either: *küçümüş bir ikinci birle* *sinâlım,* *büz ikigüdä kanyusî küçlügrâk bíz* (Wettkampf 42-44) ‘Let us
test our strength with one another (to see) which one among us two is
the stronger’ has no overt marker of subordination but the question
‘Which one of us two is the stronger one?’ must be subordinated to the
proposal made to the addressee for subsequent action. In the following
passage, finally, the content of the second sentence is the object of
*kördüm* in the first: *ya[rlikan]**ju* *kööl turgurup kördüm,* *irin,*
*[yar][l]îg umușsz inagîz bo tînlîglar montag ângâkîg [fâmi]da*
tüsînîş tururlar (U II 4.8) ‘Evoking a compassionate state of mind I
realised (that) these poor hopeless creatures had fallen into such an
(existence) of suffering.’

4.63. Clauses as adjuncts

Adjunct clauses have tasks which are adverbal to a greater or lesser
degree: I have classified them as comparative (describing to what the
events and actions of the main clause can be compared, what they are
like), as temporal, as local, as causal (expressing why or to what
purpose events take place), as final (specifying the event aimed at
when carrying out the content of the main clause) or as consecutive
detailing the result of the process described in the main clause). They
often consist of converbs, sometimes with expansions, in which case
no semantic-functional classification may apply: Such cases have been
put into the section ‘clauses with contextual converbs’: The semantic
relationship between main clause and converb clause may be
retrievable from the context or it may remain fuzzy. Some converbs do
have specific meanings and functions, however, and are dealt with in
the subsections mentioned above.

Circumstantial nominal expressions can be called nominal adjunct
clauses if they have their own topic. Such are *közi yümüglüg oloruř*
*ärî* ‘He used to sit with closed eyes’ (HTs VI 2b9) and the third noun
phrase in *özi atanmîs, ögrûmîlûg, atî yetîlig kâlîr* (IrqB LV) ‘He
comes a famous and joyful man, his horse being led (for him)’; *köz* is
the object of *yüm,* *at* of *yet,* the possessive suffixes of *közi* and *atî*
referring to the subjects of the sentences.

Adjunct clauses can also consist of verbal nominals appearing in the
dative, locative, ablative, directive, instrumental or equative cases or
getting governed by various postpositions. If adjunct clauses are based
on nominal verb forms, the functions of these are sometimes not
different from any other nominal used in the case or with the
Syntactic postposition in question: Their tasks can then be inferred from what their case form or the postposition governing them does when connected with a noun phrase; thus e.g. the -dln form and the üzä phrase in the following example: bo ülüştä Samtsa ačarö ... čoonanka barmışdën başlanur, ... ăt'öz kodmış üzä üzüllür ‘this section starts with Xuanzang going ... to Č. and ends with his dying.’

Such sentence parts are not dealt with below, as they are in fact instances of adjunct phrases rather than adjunct clauses. A number of instances for -mAk+tA are, e.g., quoted in Schulz 1978: 52-54 with, respectively, temporal, instrumental or final meanings; none of these meanings are explicit in any of the instances quoted, however, and some of them are outright misinterpretations: The meaning of all of them can be summed up as ‘locative of the infinitive’. Then take bulmayokka övkäläp kakıp tagka ünüp kükärdi ätnädi (HTsToa 538-9) ‘He (the lion) got angry and cross at not having found them, went up the mountain, roared and made noises’: The suffix combination -mAyOk+kA forms causal clauses (as discussed below). The clause around bulmayokka could here have a causal meaning; it could, however, also be the case that the dative is governed by övkälä- (‘to be angry at something’) and that bulmayokka here serves as perfect participle referring to the action: bulmayokka could, in other words, be not a causal clause but the indirect object of a verb in the main clause. Similarly the form -mAyOkkA in šilabadri ačarö ūdmayokija ayi kodĭ öpkäsi kälıp ... (HV 287) has been stated to give a temporal meaning as in ‘He (i.e. king Kumāra) got exceedingly furious when master Šīlabhadra did not send him (i.e. Xundzang) off’ but in fact we might as well understand ‘getting furious at master S.’s not sending him off’ with the dative governed by the verb phrase itself. The percentage of such unclear instances is quite high; this is not a coincidence but is linked to the origin of compounded adjunct clause suffixes, whose meaning did originally consist of the sum of the meanings of their parts. Another common uncertainty concerns the meaning actually to be assigned to adjunct clauses: of udči kalmayōkkä avintäki kślär istäyyä … (HTsToa 82-84), e.g., can be translated either as ‘When that shepherd didn’t arrive, his household looked for him …’ or ‘As that shepherd didn’t arrive, his household looked for him …’; one has to have enough unequivocal examples before one decides whether a certain clause form has one or more than one central meaning. If one determines a central meaning for a construction, then different ones can be

635 Note that the subjects of the -mlš forms here used as action nominals are not referred to by possessive suffixes.
understood as contextual variants: kūyū kozădău ačınu agrınu ãrkăn … amräka aadrilmak ačıg ämgäkkă täginürlär (Mait 198v1-6) ‘While / Although they guard and take care of them … they undergo the bitter suffering of getting separated from their dear ones’ was, e.g., by Schulz 1978: 97 stated to have concessive meaning. This reminds us that ‘while’ clauses can also get concessive meaning in English. For a special function of aorist + ārkăn to be worked out, however, it has to be determined whether this instance is not in this context merely used for an ad hoc rhetorical effect. -Ur ārkăn is here dealt with in section 4.633 on temporal clauses. The normal way for rendering concessive content is the form -sAr, especially when followed by the particle ymä (section 4.64). Concessive connotations for the sentence quoted should not, however, be excluded.

In the subsections 4.632-4.637, adjunct clauses are classified by function and meaning and not by form; 4.631 is, however, about semantically fuzzy converbs.

4.631. Clauses with contextual converbs

Contextual converbs are formed with the suffixes -(X)p, -XpAn and the exceedingly rare -XpAnXn, the vowel converb with the allomorphs -A, -I, -U and -yU and the negative counterparts of all of these: -mAIt (only Orkhon Turkic and very rare), -mAItIn and perhaps -mAksXzXn. The term ‘contextual converb’ was chosen because the hearer / reader is helped by the context to understand the semantic relationship between the clauses featuring these verb forms and the main clauses to be a temporal, a causal, a circumstantial or e.g. an adversative one or one of mere coupling.

Real vowel converbs, i.e. such that are formed from the verbal stem by the speaker ad hoc at the time of utterance or writing (unlike lexicalisations and the like, for which see section 3.286), can show close juncture with one of a set of less lexical verbs or auxiliaries and form with them complex predicates (section 3.25) or they can be quite independent from the syntactic point of view.

sürră inti (KP 64,7) describes the shepherd’s driving his herd out of the city gates; in this case convert and main action are simultaneous. In the following sentence (in HTs VIII 69) the converb tută is separated from the main verb by adverbs but still describes the same action as that referred to by the superordinated verb, ‘to write’: bo ūc acarlar … ašdimiş noml[a]rın tuta yönin yönin bitıp keğ yöرغ kilitler ‘These three teachers pinned down the teachings which (they) heard (from Xuanzang), writing (them) down one by one, and interpreted
them elaborately’. The fixation of Xuanzang’s teachings by his disciples is here described in its different aspects; pinning them down, which I have used for rendering the verb *tur-, is certainly no lesser ingredient than the physical writing (*biti-*). In the following two instances as in the last mentioned one, converb and superordinate verb are not even adjacent: *kičig teginig tilävä takä tapišmaz ärmış* ‘They had been looking for (*tilä-*) the little prince but had not yet found him’;

*kollarin örö kötürür ulug ünin ïglayu maytri burxan tapa adakätä tıpön tüsärür* ‘lifting up (*örö kötür-*) their arms, crying (*ïgla-*) in a loud voice, they fall down head downwards at Buddha Maitreya’s feet, facing him’ (describing accompanying behaviour).

The inscriptional sentence *karlok yavlak sak行业内 tăză bardă* ‘The K. had evil thoughts and fled away’ shows the typical difference between *(X)p and the vowel converb: Often, the former denotes an action by itself, the latter only one aspect of what is described by the finite verb. Longer sequences are also common; here an Orkhon Turkic series of four verbs, three of them with a conjoined vowel converb:

*kollarin örö kötürü ulug ünin ïglayu maytri burxan tapa adakätä tıpön tüsärür* ‘lifting up (*örö kötür-*) their arms, crying (*ïgla-*) in a loud voice, they fall down head downwards at Buddha Maitreya’s feet, facing him’ (describing accompanying behaviour).

The inscriptional sentence *karlok yavlak sak行业内 tăză bardă* ‘The K. had evil thoughts and fled away’ shows the typical difference between *(X)p and the vowel converb: Often, the former denotes an action by itself, the latter only one aspect of what is described by the finite verb. Longer sequences are also common; here an Orkhon Turkic series of four verbs, three of them with a conjoined vowel converb:

*akin binip oplayu tägip san•a ïdïp topulu ün ti* (K• E7) ‘He mounted (*bin-*) his white horse, attacked (*täg-*) head on (*oplayu*), routed (*san•-, them) in a whirlwind (*ïd-*) pierced (their rows, *topul-*) and emerged (*ün-, on the other side’).

In Uygur: *bodisavt tegin bo uluš bodun ayşik kilinčler kilmišin körüp ärtijü busuşlug kadgulug bolup ïglayu balıkka kirdi* ‘The bodhisattva prince saw that this nation was committing sins, he became very sad and entered the city *crying’ (*KP 3-4*).

No doubt because of such instances, Gabain 1974: 123 states that the most important difference between the vowel converb and the *(X)p converb is that the former expresses ‘ein Mittel, eine Gleichzeitigkeit’, the latter, on the other hand, ‘ein zeitliches Vorhergehen’. Above we had quoted the clauses *kollarin örö kötürür ulug ünin ïglayu ... ïglayu ...*; practically the same appears with *(X)p in nääçüki temin öglnip örö ağašlärın örö kötürürüp ulug ünin ulidarrêt* (Suv 619,18-20) ‘At some stage a short while after that they regained their senses, then raised their hands and wailed loudly’. Such converbs are semantically unspecific; the sentence just lists the three actions. The reader presumably understands that the raising of hands is a gesture accompanying the crying and wailing, thus expressing simultaneity and manner (against Gabain’s statement concerning *(X)p). Whether readers expect that all this can accompany the coming back to one’s senses or whether they think that lifting one’s arms or wailing can take place only after one is in full consciousness can differ from reader to reader depending on their

experience in life and is not expressed by the text itself. The clause *karmaputug sip tsuy kiltimiz ârsär* (TT IV A67) ‘If we have broken the precept and have sinned’, quoted in Gabain 1974: 120 as one of the examples for the view that the event referred to by the -(X)p clause precedes the other one, in fact proves exactly the opposite, as breaking precepts does not precede sinning but is simultaneous with it. There is, of course, logical sequencing in the observer’s mind, in the sense that a breach of precepts is more directly observable, a label of sinning being attached to the act by the cultural system. Similarly two parallel -(X)p clauses can refer to an act of saying and to its content: *agïçilarka ayïp üküš altun bertürüp* (HTs IV 603) can be translated either as ‘he talked to the treasurers and had them give (him) a lot of guilders ...’ or ‘he told the treasurers to give (him) a lot of guilders ...’; the latter may be preferable if on remembers that *ay*- is ‘to say’ and not ‘to speak’. What is clear is that the verb forms *ayïp* and *bertürüp* differ in denotation but not in reference, referring to the same event. Some similar instances with *ay*- are mentioned in OTWF 803 under ertür- and UW 287b under *ay*-, §1d. There is, however, a statement which probably can be made concerning anteriority and posteriority in this connection: In a chain of -(X)p forms, a subsequent instance, one to the right of another -(X)p form in Latin script, is unlikely to temporally precede the content of the first-uttered or first-written -(X)p form. Rather than being a grammatical rule, this is a consequence of the iconic principle: Where grammar does not determine the order of elements, the speaker is likely to let his enumeration follow in a manner mimicking reality: Instances such as *olguz bodun tokuz tatar birlâ terilip kâlti* (BQ E34) ‘The Oguz people got together (teril-) with the Tokuz Tatar and came (against us)’, *ol savïg äšidïp tün uðïşïkïm kâlnïdi, küntüž olorsukum kâlnïdi* (Tuñ 12) ‘Upon hearing (äšid-) that information I no longer felt like sleeping at night or sitting down during the day’ or *ol tašïg kötürüp ol kudag içïntï kâmlïlïr* (U I 8,9-10, Christian) ‘They lifted (kötür-) that stone and threw it into the well’ show the anteriority of the event recounted in the -(X)p clause; further such examples are quoted in Schulz 1978: 139. Instances such as *inçïp ârdâmïn baturup bo yerïncü yer saveda kamag ünïlgïlar ara yorïyur ârtïlïr* (TT VI 352-3) ‘They used to live on this earth among all creatures, hiding their virtues’ are, on the other hand, to be interpreted in such a way that main and -(X)p verb refer to simultaneous events; further examples are quoted in Schulz §162 (pp.139-140). *sinidin keïp nâçïk ugay mân* (U III 48,11) can best be translated as ‘How will I manage if I leave you?’, but ‘when I leave you’ is also a possibility. ‘Leaving’ cl early has to
precede here, as the question of ‘managing’ arises only as a result of that.

Vowel converbs which are syntactically independent do not differ from other converbs in getting their own objects, in not being adjacent to the superordinated verb and in referring to events which are often not simultaneous with the main event: In a runiform inscription (ŠU E4), e.g., the first verb (kāc-) in the sentence bān sālāyā kācā udu yorišim ‘I crossed over the Selenga and marched after them’ has its own object and probably refers to an event preceding the main event. The content of the vowel converb and that of the superordinated verb can well refer to differing activities, events or processes, as in aça susamak ‘to be hungry and thirsty’ (U II,1 37) with the verbs ač- ‘to be hungry’ and susar- ‘to be thirsty’; morphosyntactic subordination is here coupled with semantic and pragmatic coordination.

Some independent vowel converbs describe the means or the way by which the main action is accomplished: bir kemi siyokīn tutā īntiš ‘I got out holding on to a piece of the ship(wreck)’ (KP 54,6). The getting hold of the piece of wood or even the holding on to it (both of which are denoted by tut-) certainly preceded the getting out (iš-) of the sea or out of danger, led to the latter and made it possible. Note that ‘means’ is not among the contents dealt with in sections 4.632-7. In the following sentences the vowel converbs also refer to the means necessary for the main action to take place (for which Turkish often uses -(y)ArAk): bo ... tīnlīglar birōk būrxaŋ kōrkīn kōrū kurtulgu ārsār (U II 17,26) ‘If, however, these creatures are to be saved by seeing an appearance of Buddha, ...; tīnlīglarīg utlāyū āriglāyū alp kutgarguluk učūn ānīn tāpri tāqrisi būrxan ... tīnlīgnū kōjūlın yavalturup [...] özū īrgārūrlār (DKPAMPb 113-4) ‘Since it is difficult to save the creatures by giving them advice and admonishment (ūtlā- āriglā-), that is why Buddha, the god of gods, softens creatures’ hearts ... and welcomes them.’

It even happens (rarely) that the subject of a vowel converb and of the main verb are different, if the former is not of an agentive nature; in the following sentence it is the tip of the sun: yarīn tāŋdā kūn būnī tūga bo ... tīnlī ... ēarin ūdalagay (MaitH XIII 1r12) ‘Tomorrow at

637 Quoted by Schulz 1978: 157. The sentence there quoted after this one is misunderstood by him and contains no vowel converb.

638 In one case the suffix -mAkI is also used with instrumental meaning (mentioned in section 4.633 because other -mAkI clauses have temporal meaning). This may be the meaning of some -mAk ʿučū phrases as well. We have not devoted a subsection of section 4.63 to this content, as most clauses with such meaning are constructed around contextual converbs.
sunrise, when the tip of the sun appears, this ... creature will give up its ...

\textit{sunrise}; cf. the similar use of \textit{tağ \ ata kâli} ‘at sunrise’ in MaitH XV 10r11.\footnote{Turkish \textit{geç-e} and \textit{kal-a} in \textit{beş-i on geçe} ‘ten past five’ and \textit{beş-e on kala} ‘ten to five’ are also petrified converbs having their own subject (\textit{saat} ‘watch, clock; hour’).} Note that both subjects are in the nominative case. In the other extreme we have cases such as \textit{ävirliä ävrlmâgû tâg otrurak sav} (MaitH XIII 8r9), which appears to signify ‘resolute words which are both interpretable and uninterpretable’; here the -\textit{A} suffix would merely signify that the suffix -\textit{gU} is meant to apply for the positive base as well.\footnote{The normal converb vowel of -(\textit{X})\textit{p}- verbs is /U/ and not /A/. This might therefore actually be a scribe’s error (intending to write the next word and stopping after he wrongly wrote an \textit{alef}). The phenomenon for which this is taken to be an example is rare at best.}

Two questions have been intensively discussed concerning the -(\textit{X})\textit{p} converb, especially in Schulz 1978: 128-147 and in several publications by Johanson, e.g. Johanson 1995: One is its aspectual and taxis value, the other is the question whether it represents coordination or subordination. We have already stated that -(\textit{X})\textit{p} is unmarked as to its taxis and aspect values.\footnote{The construction consisting of \textit{nî} with -(\textit{X})\textit{p} converb, sometimes followed by the particle \textit{Ok}, refers to events immediately preceding the main action; it is discussed in section 4.633 above, among the temporal clauses. This is a distinct construction which has no bearing on our view of the functions of -(\textit{X})\textit{p}.} The second question depends on how one defines coordination and subordination. Concerning content, -(\textit{X})\textit{p} clauses may be subordinated, meaning that they describe the activity referred to in the superordinated verb or verb phrase or verb phrase + dependencies, or they may be coordinated, especially when the -(\textit{X})\textit{p} phrase itself refers to an independent event appearing in a chain of equivalent events. In Sanskrit or Mongolian one gets tales consisting of a long chain of converb clauses, often with alternating subjects, with one single finite verb at the end of the tale. Such unlimited coordination of -(\textit{X})\textit{p} clauses is not quite possible in Old Turkic, as their subjects normally have to be identical with those of the verb to which they are subordinated; with this limitation (adhered to nearly fully), -(\textit{X})\textit{p} expressions are very well capable of reflecting chains of coordinated events. Formally, however, such converbs clearly are subordinated, as they share most of their grammatical categories with some other, superordinated verb and inherit them from it; the only categories expressed by -(\textit{X})\textit{p} forms themselves are diathesis and negation.
In sözlagärn ärkän bo yünkünçeg sözlag bo đarnög sözlagünłär (Suv 129,21-22) ‘When they are about to recite it (i.e. the spell), let them (first) recite this blessing and (then) this spell’ it is clear from the meaning of -gALLr as ‘about to be doing something’ on the one hand, from the iconic order of the -(X)p form preceding the main verb on the other hand, that the recitation of the blessing, expressed by the -(X)p verb, is to precede the recitation of the spell. The semantic relationship between the -(X)p clause and the main clause can also be made explicit by particles. In a sentence from HTs V discussed in Zieme 1992a: 352 and on p.5 of Röhrborn’s edition of HTs VIII, e.g., the relationship is adversative, as incıp yana expresses this meaning: öz užiklari ymä änätkäkčäsig ök ärip inčip yana änäçäya tágsälär ‘Their own letters are just like the Indian ones but they still differ (from them) a little bit.’ The meaning ‘but’ should not be assigned to the converb, which does not exclude it but does not support it either.

When the main verb is negated, the scope of the negation does not (unlike Turkish) usually include -(X)p converbs linked to it. There is such a sentence in KT E27; here is another one: kamag kam lar terlap nää tırğümägey (M I 15,8-9) ‘All the magicians will come together (but) will be quite unable to bring him back to life’. Further examples are quoted in Schulz 1978: 128-129. In the following sentence the scope of the negation does include an -(X)pAn converb (which had been thought to be more independent than the -(X)p converb); the reason may be that te-p and te-pän are quotation particles rather than converbs: kertä ärklig kicičig täŋri te pän kertänmädimiz ārsär (Xw 56) ‘If we did not believe in the true, mighty and strong god,...’

Subjects of -(X)p converbs are normally identical to those of the superordinated verb. In the following example, the subject (hair roots) is different, but is still inalienably linked to the main subject and bears a possessive suffix referring back to that subject: ol täŋri uriși ol ünug äsldip korkup ürküp balinglap tü tüpları yokaru turup ... (U II 29, 17–18) ‘that divine son heard that voice, got frightened and panicked, his hair roots stood up upright and ...’ Similarly with kögül ‘heart’, agazım takı tataglar ‘the tastes in my mouth’ and köz ‘eye’ in the following examples: bo körünč körüp köğülün yazilti mu? (Ms. Mz 708 r 29-30 quoted in UA JB 16:295) ‘Did your heart stray seeing this pageant?’, agazım takı tataglar barca yitlinıp artokrak ačig bolup kään täŋri yarok közmätı arıt köžümmez (UIII 37,30-33) ‘The tastes in my mouth have all disappeared and have become exceedingly bitter and no sunlight appears to my eyes any more’: tü tüplari, kögül and köz are all inalienably linked to the main subject; ‘the sun’ is not but ‘seeing’ is. In the following example the converb and the main verb have objects
in common, one being an inalienable part of the other (though not marked with possessive suffix): munï iki köz täglärîp sançâyîn (KP 57.5) ‘Let me blind this person (munï), stabbing out both his eyes (köz)’; both predicates, stabbing and blinding, apply to both the person and his eyes. Note that the converb clause is introduced inside the main clause. iğ, the subject in the following sentence, also has no possessive suffix: ämtî karîdî iğlädi iğ tägïp montag körküsüz bolup yatur ‘Now he has grown old and fallen ill, illness has befallen (him), having become ugly he lies there as you see him’ (ChrManMsFr ManFr r 12); ‘illness’, of course, is inalienable as it does not exist without its victims.

Another group of -(X)p verbs which have their own subject are those referring to weather and other environmental features, as in bulûj yînjak kararîp korgâli bilgâli bolmadî (Suv 630,20-21) ‘The corners (of the world) got dark and it became impossible to see or recognise anything’.

ozu [kâ]lmiş süsin köl tegin ağıüp toqra bir uguş alpagut ärig toqra tegin yoqînta ağırip öltürtûmûz (KT N7) ‘Köl Tegin roused his army, which had come in flight, we encircled a group of Toqra knights at the funeral ceremony of prince Toqra and killed (them)’ is interesting: There is referential – though not grammatical – identity between Köl Tegin with his army (süsî) and ‘us’, the party which the author of the inscription identifies as his own, throughout the text.⁶⁴² ağı barîm in KP 7,5 is not inalienable: künînî ayya munçûlayu berîp ağîktakî ağı barîm aqînî kaltî ‘He gave (alms away) in this way day by day and month by month and (of) the riches in the storehouse there remained just a little amount’. Riches are, of course, low on the agentivity scale. The connection between ‘giving out’ (ber- with ‘riches’ as implicit object) and the paucity of the remaining riches (ağı barîm) is that what is the object of the subordinated verb is the subject of the main one. Here, finally, is the only real exception I have come across; the -(X)p verb yarlîka- has a wholly different subject from the main verb; the two subjects are fully agentive: tâpî burxan bo nom yarîq yarlîkap

⁶⁴² The conjecture for the lacuna and the reading in general are supported by a similar passage in BQ E 31; see footn. 59 above for the reading alpagut. Johanson 1992: 205 misquotes and misinterprets the sentence (teqin is fully visible; agîr- is spelled with t’ and not d’ and does not signify ‘schlug in die Flucht). The subject of ağîr- must clearly be plural (and not Köl Tegin by himself) as a single person cannot encircle anybody. A sentence from ChrManMsFr ManFr v 9, which Johanson there quotes from Schulz 1978 as a further example, does not, in fact, show subject difference between -(X)p clauses and their superordinated clause: The two converb clauses are there dependant on a temporal clause ending in -sAr; it is normal for that to have a subject differing from the main subject.
Among the few examples of -\textit{mAIt} clauses appearing in the runiform inscriptions, the following do not refer to distinct actions of their own but rather to negative reformulations of what is stated in the main clause: sâkîz oguz tokuz tatar kalmät\textsuperscript{643} kälti (\textsc{Shu} E3) ‘the eight Oguz (tribes) and the nine Tatar (tribes) did not stay away (kalmät) but came’; tiïn idimätî kîntüç olormätî … esig küçüg bertim ök (\textsc{Tuñ} 52) ‘Not sleeping by night and not resting by day I constantly gave my services (to the ruler)’. The most likely translation of \textit{hmën} esig küçüg bertökgärü sakïnmatï türk bodun ölüräyin urugsïratayïn ter ärmiş (\textsc{Kt E10}) is similar: ‘They (i.e. the Chinese) used to say ‘Let us kill and exterminate the Turk nation’, not taking into consideration (sakïnmatï) that (we i.e. the Chinese) gave (them i.e. the Turks) so much service’\textsuperscript{644} The meaning of Orkhon Turkic -\textit{mAItN} appears to have been more of the preparative type (like Turkish -(y)\textit{ArAk}): igidmiş xaganïn savïn almatïn yer sayu bardïg (\textsc{Kt S9}) ‘Not taking (almatïn) the advice of your ruler, who nourished you, you went everywhere’. The Turks’ migrations appear to have been perceived as the result of their insubordinance towards their king.

In Uygur, negative, and 

\textsuperscript{643} If this were the past tense form it would have been spelled with \textit{d}¹, presumably implying [\textit{d}]. kälti is spelled with \textit{t}¹ because the alveolar is there preceded by /l/; see section 2.409.

\textsuperscript{644} The subject of both sakïnmatï and ter ärmiş is the Chinese. \textsc{Gabain} 1974: 124-5, 180 translates the sentence as ‘weil sie so viel Arbeit und Kraft nicht widmen wollten, sagte er: ‘Ich will ...’’ and adds: Hier liegt keine zeitliche, sondern eine logische, ursächliche Aufeinanderfolge vor und dazu ein Subjektwechsel.” \textsc{Schulz} 1978: 179 corrects this: ‘Gemeint ist: ‘weil sie (die Türken) aber nicht daran dachten, ihre Arbeitskraft (den Chinesen) zur Verfügung zu stellen, sagte er ...’’. This is an unlikely way to understand the sentence, as Orkhon Turkic had the -\textit{dök}+\textit{In} ñäcm construction for forming causal clauses (see section 4.635) and there is no indication that -\textit{mAIt} could be used in this way. Nor do the instances for -\textit{mAItN} support Gabain’s interpretation, as the subjects of this form are also either identical with that of the main verb or linked to it in some metonymous way.
CHAPTER FOUR

LXI) ‘he was inadvertently caught in a snare’ or ‘as he did not notice (tuy-) anything, he …’. In the following instance the converb form is quite independent both by content and syntax: kiz yalgan tep kertgün mätin teginä inca tep tedä (KPFrAgMA 12-13) ‘The girl didn’t believe (kertgün-) him, thinking it was a lie, and spoke to the prince as follows:’; ol ämgäkig särü umadin ölçüz bolurlar (Höllen 121-122) ‘Being unable to bear that suffering they lose consciousness.’ Schulz 1978: 174 lists these two (and a lot more) as instances of -mAItIn with causal ‘function’. The sentences can, indeed, be translated with causal meaning for the converb form, but they can also be translated the way I have done it; it was the author’s choice not to make any such meaning explicit and we cannot do it in his stead. There is, of course, an implicit causal meaning here. In yanmiña oğlanlarını bulmatın yalağuz ālvirği tág bolur män (BT XIII 2.47) ‘If I do not find my children when I come back, all alone I would get insane’ the meaning of the -mAItIn form is outright conditional, since the sentence refers to a mere possibility.

It does not happen very often that the subjects of -mAItIn forms differ from the main subjects and when they do differ the two nominal phrases are generally linked with the possessive suffix. We have, e.g., agişı barımi ... âmgänmätin uktını kirür (TT VI 101-102) ‘His wealth comes in heaps without him ... working for it’. ‘wealth’ is, of course, an entity which is very low on the agentivity scale:645 the growth of wealth is a process in which the owner of that wealth is certainly the central personality, whether he is an active agent in this process or whether (as described in the sentence quoted) he is inactive. The possessed is here the subject of the main clause. The same is true in the following examples: ikiläyü tamuda tüsmätin alku ayığ külneçığ tüdğlari barça sıçıp öçüp ... (BT II 374-377) ‘they will not again fall into hell and all their hindrances (consisting of) sins will (instead) all melt away and die down’. In the next example the relational entity (ât kû buluncâ alînc ‘fame and income’) does not bear any possessive suffix: yerinçığ asığığ tilâmätin ât kû buluncâ alînc özin âk kâlip kamaqka ayaguluk cîltâgülük bolgoylar (Suv 195,19-22) ‘Not striving (tilâ-mätin) for material matters or for profit, fame and income will come (kâl-) to them by themselves, and they will be honoured by all’. Here, finally, is an example in which the possessed inalienable entity (gün ‘voice’) is the subject of the negative subordinate clause: tilâdilâr teginig yiğlayu sîgtayu buçunu, ünlüri idî sönmâdin (Suv 637,5-7)

---

645 Above we found that the same binome agi barim happens also to be the object of an -(X)p converb where the main verb has a different subject.
‘Crying, wailing and sad they searched for the prince, their voices not dying down even for a moment’. Numerous further Uygur examples for -mAtIn are quoted in Schulz 1978: 171-177: In none of those instances does the -mAtIn form have its own fully agentive and personalized subject.

The suffix sequence -mAk+sxz+Xn, with the instrumental of the privative suffix, forms another contextual converb. The subject of this form is normally identical with that of the main clause, and it never makes use of a possessive suffix to refer to it: ilämaksizin dyan olorguluk ol (ET§ 8.15) ‘One must sit in meditation without attaching oneself to anything’, tünlä küntüz armaksizin sönmaksizin bişrunup … (Suv 211,5-6) ‘exercising day and night, without getting tired and without flagging’, tönmaksizin sönmaksizin katığlanu … (BT II 389-390) ‘striving without resting and without flagging’ are some examples. Additional examples appear in Suv 235,10 (yermäksizin yalkmaksizin), 367,19 and 61 and BT ID160. The -mAksXz formation is dealt with in OTWF 396-400; it is verblike in freely governing noun phrases. In one instance quoted there, two -mAksXz forms have one instrumental suffix in common, as azlanmaksiz äsirkänmaksizin (ShôAgon 3, p.207,10) ‘greedlessly and ungrudgingly’. This instance shows that -mAksXzXn cannot be a replacement of -mAtIn, as the three elements going into the sequence do not appear to have fused. -mAksXzXn was in use in relatively late texts only.

4.632. Comparative clauses
The clauses described here introduce states of affair which the writer presents as being similar to the situation referred to in the main clause. We first deal with morphological constructions used for this purpose, then turn to cases where this content is expressed by a non-finite verb form governed by a postposition, then to clauses where such content is introduced by a conjunction and finally mention an instance with what seems to be a relative pronoun.
The equative suffix is very often added to the aorist in Manichæan texts; *aneslawa ammar ārti sizni tüzügü, anasīn ba[falasi]*$^{646}$ oglan*ni sāvārčā* (Pothi 98-99) ‘they all loved you as children love their mother’ has the same content of manner comparison as shown by nouns with +ČA. This construction with the aorist is found already in Orkhon Turkic, e.g. *tela [t...]* kövürğaşi ätærča (BQ W 3-4) ‘as when the drum’$^{647}$ of ... resounds above’. In a relatively late Buddhist text we find *talim kara kuš garudï talay oträsinta čaparča* (BT III 1000) ‘as the rapacious eagle Garuda beats his wings in the middle of the ocean’; a further example is attested in BT III 993-4. Comparative clauses are often introduced by *kaltī*, e.g. *kaltī ... yarok ay täyri yaşayu bālgūrā yarlıkärča* (M III nr.15 v13-14) ‘as e.g. the bright moon graciously appears shining’; *kaltī elig oglī teginig av(i)talar äligintā igidürča* (M III nr.7II r4-6) ‘as e.g. a king nurtures his son the prince through nannies’ or, in a slightly different construction, *inča kaltī är kim yel küvîyâ tolkukul urārča* (Windg 22-24) ‘as e.g. a man who blows a bellows by the power of the wind’. In Buddhist texts, *kaltī burxanlarïg tapïnür udunur ij* (TT VI 145) ‘as when they e.g. worship the Buddhas’ or *kaltī lenxva sayu tätin tütärča* (KP 38,5) ‘as if, e.g., smoke rose from each lotus’. Numerous Manichæan examples with and without *kaltī* are listed in Zieme 1969: 120-121. Zieme also mentions a few Buddhist instances in a note; cf. further Schulz 1978: 86.

Whereas *-čA* compares manner, Uyghur instances of *-čA* compare degree and quantity: *may may sayu adaptarïn irklâmišča bo közümür ažunakî kuti kivi assilur* (Suv 419,11-13) ‘The more he treads step by step with his feet, the more his happiness in this visible world grows’. Further examples are quoted in Schulz 1978: 87-89. *kiči yetmišča* ‘as best he can’ and similar expressions for other persons are attested in Suv 387,23-388,2, TT VA 67-68, BT VIIA 435-447 and U III 71,5-6. *-čA* (and *-_qčA*) forms are also found in adnominal use and express number, degree or quantity; see section 4.124.

In the proverb *tünkûl bûlit örtänsâ avûk urî kâldürmišča bohur, înda bûlit örtänsâ avkâ yagî kirmišča bohur* ‘When the clouds redden at night it is as though one’s wife gave birth to a male son; when they burn in the dawn it is as though the enemy entered the house’ (DLT

---

$^{646}$ The editors Bang & Gabain and Clark propose *ba[falasin]* but baba ‘father’ is not attested in Old Turkic; I take the nominative bala to be parallel to oglan.

$^{647}$ This translation is tentative: ‘drum’ is kövṛug in Old Turkic (< *kävrüg, attested in this shape in 14th century Ottoman) but ke’ürge / kö’ürge in Mongolian. If the proposed rendering which, of course, accords with the meaning of the verb, is chosen, then we would here have a variant very close to what we find in Mongolian.
fol.131) the form appears to be related neither to degree or quantity nor to postterminality; the meaning is possibly related to the reportive use of -mIš, as this is a proverb about omens.

In the examples quoted, +CA was joined to a participle with explicit subject. We also find a construction with verbal nominals referring to situations: hız su körmişdäkičä əs(ə)n tükäl turur hız (UigBrief C6) ‘We are well as when one has seen happiness’; ataları əlmişdäkičä sıgbaşgay (BT III 1029-1030) ‘They will cry as if their fathers had died’, literally, ‘as one in a situation after his father’s death’. The construction itself does not need verb forms: tirig+dā+ki+cā ‘as when one is alive’ would not be called a clause.

When +CA is joined to a -dOK form of a verb of speech with suffix reference to its subject, it expresses accordance; both aydokinčä kertü bolur ärti ‘it used to come true in accordance with what he said’ (M III nr.13, I v3) and y(a)likadok[u]mča ‘according to my command’ (unpublished ms. U 311 bv4, Wilkens 103) appear in Manichæan sources. kaltı alp är čärigkä täg irä özümün ösürkänösinin tütü idalap (Suv 395,4-10) ‘giving up my life ungrudgingly, as, e.g., a valiant man goes to the army’ is construed with the postposition tág instead of with +CA. In the following Orkhon Turkic sentence tág governs two negated aorist forms: körür körüm körmäz tág, bilir biligim bilmäz tág bльтï (KT N10) ‘My (normally) seeing eyes seemed to have lost their sight and my (otherwise) thinking mind seemed to have lost its senses’. With -mIš we have e.g. kamgak kantırkä tayaklınk köntülmiš tág (HTs VII 1975) ‘as when the kamgak plant gets upright by leaning upon hemp’; burxanïg körmiš tág sāvär taplayur ayayur agirlayurlar (TT V A 113) ‘they love, appreciate and honour (him) as if they had seen Buddha’; amți män yäräkımın tartımš tág ogulümün ösürkänösin köjüln tütü idalap buši berur män (DKPAMPb 820) ‘I now give up my son as if I had been tearing (out) my heart (but) with ungrudging mind, and give him away as alms’. -mIš tág appears also in HTs III 421-3. There is an important difference between -mIš and -mIsš: -mIš compares degree and quantity whereas -mIš tág compares the events themselves.

-mAyisk tág is the negative counterpart of -mIš tág, in sağa utruntači kišilar ančulayu bolur kaltı ... işi kudügi bülmäyök tág ‘persons opposed to you will fare like somebody who ... and his business did not succeeded’ (TT I 51) and ança täňšiğ ardıcär kaltı labay üstini tört taloy üşüz kiştğın bütürün körü umayok tág (HTs VII 531) ‘They were like persons who had not quite been able to see the shores of the four
seas in the hole of a shell'. A bit more is said below about the correlative structures used in these sentences.

We have a projection participle in kılmağt täß näßiğ aiş (U III 54,15) 'some action the like of which one isn't supposed to do'.

In yiğ aşı bişag aşı ornü ikin ara sükilip tämirliğ olşiğ olümïş osuglug tokuç ay on kün ämgäk kürürlär (MaiH XVNachtr 4r25) we have the -mlisch participle governed by the postposition osuglug 'as, like, as if, in the manner of': 'They get squeezed between the places of raw food and digested food and suffer during nine (moon) months and ten days, as if somebody had wrung them with an iron wrench'. osuglug governs the aorist in isig öz alimëlär birla turaşur osuglug turur (Suv 18,13) 'It seems as if he is struggling with his angels of death' or in iic mïn ulug mïn yertincü yer suv tâprüyür osuglug körün (TT X 139) '3000 great thousand-worlds appeared as if shaking'. The semi-predicative verbs tur- and körün- here share their predicative status with the osuglug phrases.

Analogy can be expressed also by the particle kaltï or the conjunction näçük linked to clauses with verbs in the conditional form; e.g., with both of these together: kaltï näçük ... alku ulug bodisatvlar burxan kutïşka Katiglantoklarinta tsuy irïncü ... kiiïn-ilärin kïndi kïmïxïy kilip nätäg arïdlïlar aklïnturtïlar aïrsär, ançuayu mïnïm tsuy irïncü ... kiiïn-ilärin olarmït täß arïzun alkiïzun (Suv 139,6-14) 'Just as all the great bodhisattvas got absolution from their sins when they were striving towards buddhadom and as they cleansed and cancelled them, e.g., so may also my sins get cleansed away and disappear as theirs'. That sentence and the following both have ançuayu and ymä in the main clause: inça kalitï kïsi eligi bar aïrsär ärdinîlg otugka tásars Köyül eïn ärdini avdiïliy uïrur, ... ançuayu ymä kïm birïk kïrgïncï bar ârsar burxanlutlîg ärdinîlg otugka kïrip kurtulmak tûslûg ärdini algalïi uïrur (TT VB 90-95) 'Just as, e.g., if somebody has hands and reaches the Jewel Island, he can collect jewels to his heart's desire, for instance, so anybody who has faith can, in turn, get to Buddha's Jewel Island and obtain the jewel whose fruit is freedom'. Correlative sentences with nätäg (otherwise dealt with in section 4.65) can also have comparative

---

648 The editor, Röhrborn, points out that the Chinese source refers to the unability to scoop up the waters of all the oceans. 'scooping up' is kürï-, but cf. kürp for kïri- 'to see' and then taken over ut 'hole' from the analogy following this one in the text, which refers to the inability to see the domains of the seven planets through a hole.

649 The editors unnecessarily 'emend' olümïş to olümïs, giving a passive translation as "als ob sie mit einer eisernen Schnur (?) umwunden (?) wären".
content: näätäg ... ävirgäyfüär ārsär, ançułäyv oč ... ävirä täginür män (Suv 171,16) ‘As they will deflect (their good deeds for the benefit of others), just in that way do I presume to deflect (my good deeds)’.

4.633. Temporal clauses
Temporal clauses give information about the time framework of the main clause by linking it to some subordinated event; they state whether the ‘main’ event is simultaneous with, preceding or following the subordinated event, whether it precedes or follows it by an interval perceived to be small or not particularly small etc.; they also give information about its flow in time.

There is a great number of forms and verbal phrases expressing various temporal relationships, which will be dealt with one by one below. Before that, we might mention the semantic relationship between contextual converbs and superordinated verbs, which often has a temporal component: As shown in section 4.631, events expressed by the former often precede those referred to in the latter. Especially with vowel converbs in close juncture, the two actions can be simultaneous: sürä ünti in KP 64,7, e.g., describes the shepherd’s driving (sür-) his herd out of the city gates, going out (ün-) himself. Main and subordinate actions are here carried out by the same subject. Meteorological entities can appear as subjects of vowel converbs to form temporal clauses specifying time: yarîn, taŋta, kăn burnî tuga (MaitH XIII 1r12) signifies ‘in the morning, at dawn, when the tip of the sun appears’ and tay ata kâfî (MaitH XV 10r11) ‘when dawn comes’.

By meaning, the most unmarked way to construct a temporal clause is to add -dOk+dA to the stem of its verb. This is quite common in the whole of Old Turkic and signifies ‘when’; e.g. kaŋım xagan učdokda (KT E 30, BQ E 13-14) ‘when my father the khan departed’ or uçä kök täpri asra yağîz yer kilîntokda (KT E1) ‘when the sky came into existence above and the brown earth below’ with explicit nominal subject. It also (like the dative form in Orkhon Turkic) often has the possessive suffix before the case suffix, referring to the verb’s subject: e.g. in tüüsüg yîdîn tuydokumuzda ‘when we feel the smell of the incense’ (Suv 424,18). In DreiPrinz 54 the reconstitution ävril[dök]ümtä must be correct as only -dOk would give a rounded possessive suffix. Both nominal and pronominal reference is found in ačim xagan elî kamšag boltokinta … ızgîl bodun bîrlâ süjüşdümtüz (KT N3) ‘At a time when the realm of my father the xagan had become shaky … we fought against the I. nation’. A Manichæan example is bo yer suv on kat kök
When he created this world (and) the ten-fold sky it was similar to that. Here is an example for identity of subjects in the main and the subordinate clause: *yakin tägdöktä ... täpri burxan adaköntä bagirin suna yarip inca tep tedilär* (TT X 172-176) ‘When they had gotten close they ... prostrated themselves before divine Buddha stretching forth their breasts and spoke as follows.’ The form can be joined by the particle *Ok*: *yad ellig toyin ain äsidöktä ök ätözüm köşülüm hıtíri ögirip sävinip ...* (HTsBiogr 295) ‘Just hearing the name of the foreign monk, my body and heart get full of joy and ...’. Another instance of *-dOkdA Ok* is quoted below, among the examples for *-mAzkAn*. Many additional, mostly Buddhist examples for *-dOk+dA constructions* can be found in Eraslan 1980: 70-71 and Schulz 1978: 57-68.

The locative is temporal also when it governs the projection participle in *-gU*: *tünli larig kutgarguda, e.g., signifies ‘when one goes about saving living creatures’, ädgülü ayigli kilinci lar ning täskiri täggüda* (BT II 925-928) ‘when (in the future) the retribution for good and bad deeds arrives’, *bo nomug oküguda* (Suv 33,21-22) ‘when intending to read this sūtra’. With this construction the subjects of the main and of the subordinate clause are distinct. The *-gUdA sequence* does not appear ever to get a possessive suffix to refer to its subject; indeed instances with explicit subject are rare. Implicit subjects of main and subordinate clause can be identical, as happens with the instances quoted, or different.

Temporal datives (discussed in section 4.1104) are common in the Orkhon inscriptions: Nominals in the dative case serve as temporal adjuncts. In the following example, however, the adjunct includes topic and comment: *köl tegin yetı otuz yaşıña karlık bodun ... yağı bolți* (KT N1) ‘When K.T. was 27 years old the K. people turned hostile’. This, then, is a nominal clause as temporal adjunct. The sequence *-dOk + possessive suffix referring to subject + dative* is found only in Orkhon Turkic, possibly with the same temporal meaning: *olordokuma ... türk bäglär bodun ögirip səvinip* (BQ E2) ‘when I was enthroned, the Turk lords and people rejoiced’ (*-dOk form representing action*); a similar phrase appears also in BQ N9. Another possibility is that the dative was here governed by *ögir- səvin-*, giving the meaning ‘they rejoiced at my being enthroned’ or ‘seeing that I was enthroned, they rejoiced’: The BQ passage is damaged and the dative could there also have been governed by a verb or a biverb lost in the lacuna.

Uygur has a different type of temporal clause using the dative: *-mAk with possessive and dative suffixes in instrumental or temporal use.*
The infinitive phrase ⚺é ãay ártmäkiŋä (U II 22,22-24) ‘after 3 months had passed’, e.g., specifies after what stretch in time the action referred to in the main clause took place. Similar clauses with ártmäkiŋä are attested in U III 82,6-10, HTs IV 620-622 and Suv 393,19-23; cf. ʻur keč bolmäkiŋa ‘when a lot of time had gone bye’ in HTs IV 93-95. The Orkhon Turkic clause köl tegin yeti otuc yaśıŋa quoted in the previous paragraph should possibly also be understood in this sense, i.e. ‘after K.T. became 27 years old’. When -mAkHŋA forms are not accompanied by time expressions, as is the case with the attested instances, they may convey the ‘means’ employed towards a goal: kántu ʻözüniŋ kaŋğlanmaksiŋa köŋülün yuʁakın vaźir tâğ kîlıp alku bizni barça utup yegädıp biznidâ ʻøjrâ burxan kuţün bultači bolți (U IV A 265-268) ‘Through his own exertion he made his heart as (hard as) vajra, surpassed all of us and has become destined for buddhahood before us’. Such instrumental content is otherwise expressed by -(X)p converbs.

The composite suffix -mIš+dA is not attested in Orkhon Turkic but is rather common in Uygur. Clauses formed with it generally refer to events preceding the superordinated event: anʉda öprö ʻur keč üdîlär ártmäştä pratikabut dentarnïŋ átʻözün luolår luор ordosîŋa elđîlär (Mait 196r20-23) ‘After that, when a long time had passed, the dragons carried the body of the pratyekabuddha monk to the dragons’ castle’; ötrö ol braxmadatï elig tiši bars birlä yazümistișa adîn bir ünîlîg tiši bars karınıtä turgum âzün tudî (U III 63,12-15) ‘Then, after the king Brahmadatta had sinned with the tigress, an aberrant creature found life in the tigress’es belly’; tingali olormışta ây uharga tegin iki inläriŋä inçe lep tedi (Suv 608,15-17) ‘When they sat down to rest, the eldest prince said to his two younger brothers:’. In the examples quoted, the subjects of the main and subordinate clauses were distinct. min vap-xua … kitaydı̱n kâlmıştä bo ámîg iki kata okiyu tâgintim (M I 29,9-14, Manichæan) ‘I V., … endeavoured to recite this healant twice after having gotten back from China’ shows subject identity in main and subordinate clause; in another postterminal instance in TT X 537 the subjects of the main and the subordinate clauses are also identical, and in both examples the pronoun ‘I’ is explicit in the subordinate clause as well. In the sentence kumrədın ketmıştä bermâdï (NestTÜ 662,6-7, Christian) ‘When (I) left the monastery (he) didn’t give (me the wine either)’, the two subjects are different and understood to be so only from the context. In MaitH Y 202, on the other hand, we have a form with possessive suffix although there is explicit nominal reference to the subject, which is that of the main clause as well: kayu üdîn bilîgsiz.
virutak elig bëg kapilavastu balïktakï šakilarïg ölürüp yok yodun kïlmišïnta ... aliï kïzïlarïg bulun alip kislïmï ærti ‘Upon killing and annihilating šâkïyas in the city of Kapilavastu, the senseless king Virûdhaka had taken six ... girls as prisoners and married them’.

In the following sentence, the -mlîštA form, itself marked for reference to its subject beside being accompanied by a pronoun, does not refer to an event preceding the main event: biz önïtkïkïdin kïlmišïmizdï sintu ögïz suvïn kïçïr arkän bir yïk nom suvïk kaltï ærti (HTs VII 2045-6) ‘When we were on our way from India, while crossing the waters of the Indus river, a load of holy books had gotten lost in the water’. The ‘normal’ taxis value of -mlîštA cannot, then, be taken for granted; tense appears here to have overruled it.

The locative of the aorist gives the meaning ‘while’, i.e. an overlapping of the course of two events: ülgïsïz sansïz yïz mïy tïmän tïnlïlgïr uguşï ükïs tïlïm aëçïg tarka ümgïkïg tïginïrïdï öyï sakïnï konï im bodïsatïvïg birïk atasar öyï üdrïlïrïlïr adadïn (BuddhGed 55-58) ‘If, however, the multitude of countless 100,000s of myriads of living beings remember the bodhisattva Guanyin and call upon him while they experience (tïginïrïdï) lots of bitter suffering, he will get rid of the trouble’. With subject of the temporal clause distinct from that of the main clause and expressed by a possessive suffix: män önçïp ... tïprïkïm višayïg mïjjïlïrïg ... tïginïrïmüntï önçï tep im üsïdïlï (U II 30,28-33) ‘While I was in this way ... experiencing divine sense pleasures ... I heard a voice saying the following:’.

Nominal forms of verbs referring to the action can also get governed by postpositions, which mostly have temporal tasks. -mlîštA bïrï, e.g., signifies ‘since’, e.g. in yer tïnçri tïrïmïštï bïrï ‘since the time when earth and sky came into existence’ (KP 5,8), -mlîštA ken ‘after’, e.g. kuvrag yiğîlïmïsïtï ken (MaitH XX Ir10) ‘after the community assembles’. The former phrase appears as -mlîšt+dlIn bïrï e.g. in HTs VII 619. In Orkhan Turkic we have -dOkdA kesrä in this meaning: yağru kondokda kesrä aëçïg bilïg ânta öyïr ârmiš (KT S5) ‘After they (i.e. the Turks) had settled near them they (the Chinese) were straightway thinking bad thoughts’. Manichaean texts have -dOkdA bïrï and -dOkdA ken: sans(ï)z tïmän yiïl bïltï sïzïntï adr(ï)tïkïda bïrï

650 The editors’ translation of this as “als” instead of ‘nachdem’ is unjustified.
(M I 10,5) ‘Innumerable myriads of years have passed since we got separated from you!’; \textit{on čaxšap(i)t tudokumuzda bārū ‘since we kept the ten commandments’ (Xw 148)}. With \textit{ken} we have \textit{tāpri mani burxan tāpri yeriğārū bardokĩnta ken ‘after the divine prophet Mani went to the abode of gods’ (M I 12,14). The adverb \textit{ašnu ‘earlier, before’ also has a rare use as postposition; see section 4.21. In constructions like \textit{tūŋūr bōsāk boltokta ašnu üdgū kūn körūrlar ‘Before they become relatives by marriage they search for an auspicious day’ (TT VI 310) it becomes the head of a temporal clause. A ms. variant of this passage has boltokta ašnuča instead of boltokta ašnu; another example for -\textit{Dok}a ašnuča is quoted in UW 244a under §B). These may either be cases of ašnuča used as postposition, as we read in the UW, or the suffix +\textit{č}a may have been added to the whole temporal clause. In \textit{kačan tapiğ udug kılıguluk törösün ãrtdürtökdā ötrö astup ičintā bâklädilār} (Suv 627,19-20) ‘After they had at some stage finished the ceremony of doing obeisance, they fastened it (i.e. the relic) inside the stūpa’ ötrö either governs the -\textit{Dok}a form or is an adverb, but there may not be any content difference between these two options of analysis. The clause is introduced by \textit{kačan}, which is basically not a conjunction but an indefinite temporal pronoun signifying ‘at a certain point’; cf. \textit{ögsüz bolup yertā kamīltī. kačan ãglântökdā} (DKPAMPb 131) ‘He lost his senses and fell to the ground. When, at some stage, he came back to his senses, ...’. \textit{sayu} is an unusual postposition in that it unites local or temporal content with the meaning ‘every’. Its use with a verb form gives temporal meaning in TT I 119-120, as would happen if the form were in the locative case: täprätök sayu iš küdküŋ tapiyča; olortok sayu oron yurt ãgiŋçä ‘Every time (you) move, your work and your business are according to your wish; every time you settle down, the place and camp are according to mind’; further examples appear in TT I 137-138.

The construction consisting of the vowel converb followed by the postposition \textit{birlā} refers to an event preceding the event of the main clause by a very short time interval: \textit{öz ârîgliğ oronlarändig turu birlā ‘the moment they had gotten up from where they had been sleeping’ (Maue 1996: 93); elîg bâg katuni birlā ikãgû ãsidû birlâ bo savîg ãgsirâdîlîr} (Suv 639,18) ‘the moment the king and his wife heard this matter they fainted’. Further examples appear in Suv 640,22, HTs VII 1212, VIII 40 etc. The immediacy of the subsequent event can be stressed by \textit{ök}, as in \textit{înçïp ãglîyû birlâ ök ... òlîp barkû} (Suv 4,17) ‘Then, a short while after he got ill he ... died away’. Then we have \textit{nâ}
opening such clauses: \( \text{nä ünä birlä ök ... tiril-} \) (Suv 16,13-16) ‘the moment (I) got out, I ... came back to life’ or \( \text{nä bo irü bälglür bolu birlä ök, ötrö ... boltï} \) (Suv 381,8) ‘Immediately after these signs appeared, there happened ...’. In the last instance, \( \text{birlä ök} \) is followed by \( \text{ötrö} \) and it can also be followed by \( \text{anta} \). Cf., finally, \( \text{anagam kutïn bülmiš kişi ... önlüg tägyri yerinï tugar. nä tuga birlä ök arxant kutïn bulup ...} \) (MaitH Y 446) ‘The person who has attained the status of \( \text{anâgâmin} ... \) gets born in the Divine Country of Appearances. The moment he gets born he attains arhathood and ...’. I assume that \( \text{birlä} \) does not, in this construction, govern the converb. Rather, the converb itself is probably here in temporal use, as in the previous paragraph, and \( \text{birlä} \) is an adverb here signifying ‘at once’.

Clauses with the \(-\text{X}p\) converb are used in a construction with similar meaning, where the clause starts with \( \text{nä ‘what’} \): \( \text{nä anï ulugï mahabalï tegin körüp inï tep tedï} \) (Suv 609,23-610,2) ‘When the oldest prince, Mahâbala, saw this, he spoke as follows’: With \( \text{Ok: tokuz älig şlok sölldï. nä sözlüyï tükäkip ök ünüp yorüp bardï} \) (BT I A\(_1\) 11) ‘He recited 49 çahâs. The moment he had finished reciting, he got up and walked away’; \( \text{nä anï körüp ök ärözlärin ol süçuk üzä kamışïp ... kamiltïlar} \) (Suv 619,16-18) ‘The moment they saw that, they threw themselves on those bones and ... collapsed’. \( \text{nä} \) sometimes appears also at the beginning of vowel converb + \( \text{birlä} \) clauses and temporal -\( \text{sAr} \) clauses.

The petrified participles \( \text{är-kli} \) (runiform inscriptions) and \( \text{är-kän} \) (the rest of Old Turkic) can be defined as postposed conjunctions. \( \text{ärkli} \) is joined to the aorist to form clauses describing some circumstance within which the event in the main clause is couched: \( \text{ancâ okurur ärkli oguzdunat küräg kälti} \) (Tuñ 8) ‘While (we were) living in that manner, there came a deserter from the side of the Oguz’; \( \text{çeä ay batar ärkli sünbüklïm} \) ‘I fought at night, when the moon had set’ (ŠU E1); \( \text{tug taškar ärkli yälmä äri kälti} \) ‘The banner being out, there came a man from the vanguard’ (ŠU E5); \( \text{karlok bodun (buşsz) ärür barur ärkli yagi boltï} \) (KT N1 & BQ E29) ‘the K. people, while living without worries, (unexpectedly) turned hostile’.\(^{651}\) This last mentioned (double)
instance is the only one among the ones we have where the subject of
the construction is the same as that of the main verb; our interpretation
may therefore be wrong: Those living without worries (and hence
surprised by the Karlok transformation) may be the Türk; what
prevents this interpretation is the position of the words karlok bodun
before the ärkli clause. olor-, bat- and tašık- are initial-transformative
verbs, denoting both the beginning of a state of affairs (‘sit down’, ‘set’
and ‘go out’) and the continuing situation (‘sit’, ‘(of the moon) be
invisible’ and ‘be out’). In these constructions denoting concomitant
circumstances, it is not the initial but the intraterminal state which is
selected; this is also what we have in the ärür barur ärkli clause. In KT
NI/BQ E29 and Tuñ 8, the two Orkhon Turkic examples, the
subordinated activity precedes the event described in the main clause
and is interrupted by it; in the other two, however, the ŠU (Uygur
Steppe Empire inscription) examples, there is no such interruption.

ärkän, the Uygur counterpart of ärkli, is rather rare in Manichæan
sources. It can govern nominal clauses, e.g. in Manichæan yer tägri yeok
ärkän (Xw 133-4) ‘when land and sky (did) not exist’. Instances of
ärkän with nominal clauses appear also in QB 1493, 2055 and 4851.
The clause siz änätkäkdä ‘You are in India’ is governed in the
following sentence: siz änätkäkdä ärkän bo ačarı uz[alı]t sizi birilä
sözläšip ...(HTs VII 1815-16) ‘While you were in India, this teacher
had a long conversation with you’. ärkän governs a locative also in
karanta ärkän yig oglın tüşürtümüz (MaitH XX 14r27) ‘We aborted
their unripe child while (it) was in the belly (karín). This sentence can
show us how the passage of ärkän from being a -gAn participle of the
copula är- to becoming a temporal conjunction could have taken place:
Interpreting är-gän as a participle we could have translated ‘We
aborted their unripe child which was in the belly’, which would have
been perfectly appropriate as well for the context.

Normally, however, ärkän governs the aorist (as ärkli does). In a
Manichæan text (Xw 159-160) we have alkanur ärkän köŋülümüzni
sakımümznı täyrigär ütümümüz ärısär ‘if, while praising God, we did
not keep our heart and thoughts directed towards him’. Here is one
Buddhist example: yana biz änätkäktin kälmişümzdä sindü ögüz suvín
kacıär ärkän ḅr Buckley nom suvda kaldiär (HTs VII 2047) ‘Moreover
while we were crossing the Indus river on our way back home from

Tekin 1968: 270, 276 is probably wrong in taking the expression to be attributive in KT
but not in BQ and translating the passage as ‘became an enemy who began to behave
freely and fearlessly’ in the former case, as the texts are parallel and the meaning of
buvsuz ‘without worries’ has to be taken into consideration.
India, one load of treatises was lost in the water’. In the first sentence mentioned, the subjects of main and subordinate clause are the same, while they differ in the second sentence. In inçip ıglayı bırlä ök sav söz kodup tutar kapar ärkän ölüp bardı (Suv 4,17-19) ‘Having just gotten ill he lost the power of speech and, while catching up, he suddenly died away’ ärkän governs a biverb, i.e. two near-synonymous verbs used together for expressivity. Numerous additional Buddhist examples are quoted in Schulz 1978: 94-101; here is one introduced by kaltï: kaltï balık kapaga olorur ärkän xan uḍrüsi beş yüz uḍ sürä ünti (KP 64–65) ‘As he (the protagonist of the story) was, in that way, sitting by the city gate, the king’s shepherd came out driving 500 heads of cattle’.

Here is an example for the sequence -qAllr ärkän: bo törtägü ünüp bargalıır ärkän ... bitig käldi (HTsToa 1472) ‘when these four were about to leave for their journey, there came a letter ...’; another example is quoted above at the end of section 3.285.

-mAz ärkän appears to be quite rare; e.g.: män nän kilmaş ärkän, mün yazoklar idişiń ... adırtılıg bilmüz üddü ärür ärkän anam xatundin adrück bir azunluğ husuş kağu köşülümükä sapılıp ... (HTsPar 19v26-20r11) ‘While I wasn’t doing anything, while I was at a stage when I did not clearly ... know the vessel of sins, I was separated from my lady mother, sorrow for a whole life was grafted in my heart and ...’.

The rather common construction with -mAzkAn is not, by meaning, the negative counterpart of aorist + ärkän, as it does not supply the main clause with a temporal framework during which the main action took place (as -mAz ärkän does). In most examples it appears together with the particle takï, giving the meaning ‘not yet’: sağırm takï bümazkän, etä bašlađokta ok ... tänträin ordolar bälglülüg boltï (Mait 52r19-22) ‘When the monastery was not yet ready, when they just had begun to construct it, ... there appeared divine palaces’. -mAzkAn may have been formed with the particle kAn discussed in section 3.341 among the emphatic particles (note that it correlates with Ok in the example just quoted). The problem with this is that -mAz would only be made adverbial through the addition of kAn while the elements referred to in section 3.341 as bases of kAn are adverbial in the first place. There are further examples for takï V-mAzkAn e.g. in HTsToa 203-204 and 433-437, UigSünd 44-46 (thrice ‘as long as ... not’), U II 87,60-62, Suv 4,3-8, 6,21-7,2 and 623,1-8, HTsPar 13r13-15. One example without takï appears in IrqB XXI. Here is another one, with its subject distinct from the subject of the main clause: kün tänrî tugmaşkan ol ok ûv içindä olorup kara önlig aşlarig aşanızn (Suv 362,4-7) ‘Let him sit in that same house before sunrise and eat dark-coloured food’.
-gInč'A has two different meanings, depending on whether the base verb is of the type which needs to have passed a critical point to be considered to have been realised, or whether it gets realised without a critical point: In the first case it signifies ‘until’, in the second case ‘as long as’, stressing the parallelism of temporal extension between main and subordinate verb. Without a critical point we have, e.g. kâči yetginčä dârnî sözlâniš kârgük (TT V A 73-74) ‘One should recite the spell as long as one is able to’; kâtîg kertginčölôg bolmagînčä ojargâlî bolmaž (HTsPar 16r5) ‘As long as one is devoid of strong faith one cannot get well’. Note that both main and subordinated clauses of the instances quoted have generalised subjects. Other instances with -mAgInč'A appear in HTsPar 16r2 and Suv 392,15.

With verbs which denote actions having a critical point, -gInč'A signifies ‘until’, e.g. anêçakanâti turnmagay mân tâñrîm káltî siznîdin burxan qûñga alkiš bulmagînčâ ‘I will not stand up, my lord, as long as I do not receive from you the prophesy of buddhadom’ with the subject of the subordinate clause the same as that of the main clause. ińcâ sokup lašap bakîr ešiçta sargargînčâ kâqurup kînčît yagiçña bulgap ... (Heilk I 172-174) ‘crush it finely, roast it in a copper pot till it gets yellow, roll it in sesame oil ...’ or ašäkkî berîginčâ bo yerîjimî yezün (RH13,14-15 in SammlUigKontr 2) ‘Till (I) give the donkey back, he (i.e. the lender) may live off this land of mine’ has an implicit subordinated subject differing from the main one, mân kâlgînčä âvîg barkîg uz tutgîl (U III 81,18) ‘Keep house well until I come’ an explicit subordinated subject (in the nominative) differing from the main subject. The meaning of yangînčâ (BT XIII 2,43) ‘till I come back’ is very similar to this last instance.

-gAll (for which see also section 3.286) can have either a temporal or a final meaning (section 4.636); the final use of -gAll forms shades off into that of a supine (section 4.23). The -sAr form is another one having a temporal meaning beside its conditional one, but it is easy to see how these two meanings could have been related historically. Concerning -gAll no connection seems apparent between the different uses. In its temporal meaning, the -gAll form presents circumstances described in a main clause as taking place since the ones referred to in a converbial clause, the so-called abtemporal meaning: Türk xagan olorgâlî ... talay oğuzkâ tâgniš yok ârmiš ‘It is said that nobody reached ... the ocean since a Turk xagan was enthroned’ is Orkhon Turkic (Tuñ 18). In Uygur, temporal -gAll is limited to Buddhist texts; Manichaean sources
do not have it. Most instances, as the following two, have bol- in the main clause: adrlgali  yirlgali aru aru [ür] kec boltu (HTs VII 2064) ‘Bye and bye it has become a long time since (we) parted’; änüklgali yedi kün bolmiş (Suv 610,2-3) ‘It turns out that she (the tigeress) bore her cubs seven days ago’. More examples are discussed in Schulz 1978: 108-113. Schulz also quotes an instance from QB 5685, the only example for temporal -gAlI he found in that text, where the main clause has kaç- in one ms. but bol-, as in Uygur, in the other two ms.. Temporal -gAlI appears to have been replaced at least partially by analytical converb equivalents such as -mIš da bärü and -dOkda bärü; the fact that -gAlI forms are also found in final and supine use must have helped this process.

Clauses with -sAr with no interrogative pronouns, whose central meaning is conditional, are also sometimes purely temporal; the suffix itself can then be translated as ‘when’: ötürük ya koluguçalar kalsar ağiçlarig bulmaz art. Bergü bulmaän koluguçalar yığlayu barsar tegin ymnä ıglayu kalır artı (KP 10,3-6) ‘When, a short while later, the beggars came, they (or rather he, the prince) wouldn’t find the treasurers; when he couldn’t find anything to give and the beggars (subordinated subject in the nominative) went away crying, the prince would stay behind, also crying’. Another example for inability in the main clause appears in U I 8: megoçlar ol uşışg alip öz atasıları kötırrü umatılar. ıllıka ıtyürsär ıllı kötırrü umatı ‘The magi took that stone but weren’t themselves able to carry it. When they (implicit subject different from the subject of the main clause) loaded it on a horse the horse couldn’t carry it (either).’ The temporal meaning can be most clearly made out if the event referred to is situated in the past, as in the quoted examples. Otherwise the distinction between temporality and condition can get blurred, e.g.: ölürjali elitärärlar maşrayur üntayır (M III nr. 14 v1) ‘When / If they (subordinated subject differing from main subject) lead it (i.e. the sheep) to slaughter it bleats and calls out’; kaq kazgansar oglı üçün temez mı? ‘When / If a father has earnings, doesn’t he consider it to be for his son?’ (KP 8,3). The Orkhon Turke sentence üd tapyri aysar kisi oglı kop ölgeli törümiş can signify ‘The sons of men are all born to die when god sets the time’ but a conditional meaning like ‘Since it is god who determines timing, the sons of men are all born to die’ cannot be excluded. For the following instance a conditional interpretation seems excluded: nipur etigin

---

652 As German wenn ‘if’ is historically the same as wann ‘when’ and English when.
etlig adakin man yap yorisor oyun küg arasinta aya yap[ınıp ...] yaraš yoriyur (TT X 440) ‘When she walks treading with her feet adorned with jewels, she walks harmoniously, with dance and song, clapping her hands’. Unlike the previous examples, the subject of the subordinate clause is here identical with that of the main clause. In all the examples quoted, the subordinate verb phrase consists of a simple -sAr form; in none of them is there an analytical phrase consisting of a verb form together with är-sär.

Indefinite temporal pronouns are often coupled with a temporal interpretation: kačan öläm yangi kalsär tolıp âtiẓin íditüp sasitüp ... (TT X 547) ‘When, at some stage (= kačan), the enemy death comes, it makes her whole body stink ...’. kačan ol mögoçlar bıdılšımka tägdilär ārsär ol yüzuz täprämädin şük turdi ‘When, eventually, those Magi (subordinated subject in the nominative) reached Bethlehem, ...’ (U I 6, Magi). In DLT fol.54 we find a temporal -sA form with kälî; kışša etiin kälsä käli kultug yay ‘Prepare (intransitive et-in-) for winter when blessed summer comes’. näcädä can also be used with temporal -sAr clauses: näcädä ölsär ‘when, at some time, he dies, ...’ (U III 43,19); with similar content and grammatical shape but much more elaborately TT X 539. The best translation for näcädä birök with -sAr verb appears to be ‘anytime when’, e.g. näcädä birök ... bafška kalsär, ... ašmuča män çığayını käyinta käl[r] ârdi (HTs 83) ‘Anytime when he came to town, however, he first used to come to the alley of poor me’; näcädä birök bo türüm tariñ yörgiläg nom ârdini yitlinser batsar, ötö ančada ... köni nomlar kertü yörgilär ymä barça yitliŋaylar bagtyalar (Suv 197,17). These elements are not conjunctions but add some vague temporal content. When, however, kačan is used with a finite verb form, it obviously is the subordinating element, as in kačan ečišin [kål]mišin uğurak bili, anı fok[... ] käntkä barti (U III 86,18) ‘When he got certain news that his elder brother had arrived, he immediately went to the town (of Benares)’.

Above we saw temporal clauses starting with nā ‘what’ and containing either the vowel converb followed by the postposition birlä or by birlä ök, or the -(X)p converb, sometimes also followed by Ok. Temporal -sAr clauses can also open with nā: nā ölsärler anta ok ẓin eštılır, ‘tirilgylär, tirilgylär’ iep (MaitH XXV 3v15 + Mait Taf 81v31) ‘The moment they die, a voice is immediately heard saying ‘Get back to life, get back to life!’ Like the other two constructions starting with

\(^{653}\) Unnecessarily changed to ‘anun’ by the editors.
nä, this one as well gives the meaning of the main action following immediately upon the subordinated one. The construction cannot get misunderstood for the ones described in section 4.65 (where the subordinate clause also starts with an interrogative-indefinite pronoun and has a -sAr form), because there the reference of the interrogative-indefinite pronoun is taken up by a demonstrative in the main clause (which doesn’t happen here).\

654 nä körsär in HTs III 776 signifies ‘When he suddenly looked up, there was ...’.

In the second Christian text (r 15) in ChrManMsFr, the meaning ‘when’ is expressed by näçük and a finite form: näçük eşidi ol buzagu [...] öginiñ ünin, [tär]kin yügürüp kälti [ö]giñärü ‘When that calf heard its mother’s voice, it immediately came running towards its mother’. The next two instances, which appear in a different Christian text, show näçük instead of näçük and use it with the conditional: näçük bulsär sizlar ... maña ištidarũñlär ... ol mogoçlar näçük urũšlũñtũn ünüñ bardũlar ārsär ol yurtuz ŋnũ olarnũ birlũ barũ ārdũ (U I 6,2-6) ‘When you find (him) ... tell me (about it) ... w hen those Magi left Jerusalem that star was still proceeding together with them’. The temporal use of näçük(ın) may be limited to the Christian sources, as this element otherwise signifies ‘how’, ‘as’ or even ‘why’.

We do also find correlative pairs of pronouns with temporal meaning, but these pronouns are in adverbial case forms or appear in phrases with temporal meaning. The sentence näcä yügürür ärti ança kusar yarşiýur ärti (M I 7,12-13) ‘As he was running, so was he vomiting and feeling disgust’ describes the action of running as taking place in parallel to the other two. This also is a temporal relationship, as the vomiting and disgust are not the result of the running; unless the translation should be ‘The more he ran the more he vomited and felt disgusted’ (which seems unlikely). The link between the two sentences is secured by the correlative pair näcä ... ança. The following sentence also shows an interrogative-indefinite pronoun, kayu üd-iün ‘in whatever time’, in the temporal clause and a demonstrative pronoun in the main clause; kayu üdün män beş törlüg ulug tüläg kördüm ärti, antada bãrü ... ołorgali küssäýür ärtim (MaitH XI 4v18) ‘When I had seen the 5 sorts of great dreams, since then was I wishing to sit ...’. 655 Here, however, the two pronouns are not in correlation; the subordinate clause is construed so as to supply a static time frame, but the main clause takes up the time

654 Beside the fact that nä cannot be the object of 尔斯är because the verb is intransitive and cannot be its subject because this latter is shown to be plural.

655 Another temporal clause starting with kayu üdün is quoted earlier in this section, in the paragraph dealing with -mIšdA.
referred to in that subordinate clause as a point, the starting point of a situation existing since that previous time and the time of the story. The normal way to correlate interrogative and demonstrative pronouns is with -sAr; in MaitH Y 286-302 we have several pairs of such temporal sentences: nācākā tāgī bo sansar ičintā ngmiš tinliğlar ... tört tugumlug kışag tanagta kösilur taniłur ārsärler, ančaka tāgī utun tetirlär. ... kayu üdün sākiz tūrlüg tūzūn yollug yarok yula köküzlərintä bälgürsär, ... ol üdün temin ök tūzūn tetirlär 'As long as creatures born in this samsāra ... are squeezed in and fettered by the tongs and fetters of the four (types of) birth, so long are they considered to be shameless. ... When the beacon of the eightfold righteous way appears in their breast, ... only at that point in time are they considered to be righteous'.

The correlative pair ančakatäği ... nācākätäği also appears in a temporal clause signifying 'as long as' e.g. in MaitH XV 3r27-8; in MaitH Y 316 we find kayu üdün ... temin ök.

4.634. Local clauses

While temporal clauses constitute a rich and complex system, there hardly are any local adjunct clauses. The reason may be that temporal relationships are normally linked to events whereas place is more often described with phrases not involving verbs; local relative clauses are very common.

There are rare Uygur instances of local clauses built around a correlation of interrogative-indefinite and demonstrative pronouns governed by the postpositions sūgar or yīṇak: ol tāngri urisi ... tavranu kavyutin sīngar tāngrīlər eliği xormuṣta tāngri ārsar, antin sūgar yakin barıp ... adaklarinta töpösi izá yükümüp ... (U II 29, 19-21) 'that divine boy hurriedly went into the direction in which the king Indra, the king of kings was, bowed to him by putting his head on the ground before his feet and ...'. The subordinated verb is conditional in the previous example but indicative in the following one: kavyutin yīṇak ayagka tägimliğ bursan bolur ärti, antin yīṇak ... (TT X 83-85) 'In whatever direction the venerable Buddha happened to be, in that direction (he, told him, to go and do obeisance to him)'. Both of these instances describe the target of motion described in the main clause.

Both spelled as one word, although tägī is, of course, a postposition governing the dative form of these pronouns.
4.635. Causal clauses
The speaker/writer had several means at his disposal for constructing clauses supplying causes: the infinitive in the ablative, perfect participles in the instrumental or in the dative or governed by ücün or further analytical means. ücün signifies 'because' with factive verbal nominals such as -mlš and -dOk but 'so as to', in order to' with non-factive ones such as -gAlIr or -gU; these latter are discussed in the section on final clauses, which follows the present one. With nominal clauses it usually signifies 'because' but can also sometimes give final meaning. In these constructions ücün subordinates predicative relationships joining comments to (sometimes implicit) topics.

Here, then, are a few examples with factive nominal clauses: ol elig burxan kütüga kataglanur bodisavt ücün (Aranemi I a r 14) 'because that king was a bodhisattva striving for buddhahood'. In maxakašya(ap arxantag ayagka tägimlig ücün täŋri täŋrişi şakimun burxan ornüga olgurri yarlıkladı (Mait 170r7) 'The god of gods the Buddha Śākyamuni seated the arhat Mahākāśyapa on his (own) seat because he was worthy of honour' the clause subordinated by ücün is the nominal clause *maxakašya arxant ayagka tägimlig ärı̈r; its topic is deleted because it appears in the main clause. Further examples appear in HTs V 100-106 (twice), BT I A 2 19-21 (all quoted elsewhere in this book). The construction existed already in Orkhon Turkic, as in küm eliğüm bar ücün 'since I had fortune and good luck' (BQ E23) and bägläri bodunü tüzsüz ücün 'because the lords and the people were in disaccord' (BQ E6). Laut 1986: 49 n.2 makes likely that tömgäsin ücün (Mait 2r2) signifies 'even though they are foolish'; here the meaning would not be causal, then, but concessive. Note that constructions with -sAr can also have concessive meaning beside the more usual conditional one. Although tömgäsin is a noun form, what is here governed by ücün is not this word by itself but the word as predicated upon 'they', referred to by the possessive suffix. When the topic of a clause subordinated by ücün is the 1st or 2nd person, this is also expressed by a possessive suffix, as in yavlaküün ücün (KT) 'because you are bad'. In tünligarig ütlüyü ürğläyü alp katgarguluk ücün 'because it is difficult to save living beings through advice and admonishment' (DKPAMPb 115) ücün, governs a small clause (see section 3.284) under -gUlXk.

In Orkhon Turkic the -dOk + possessive suffix in the accusative + ücün construction is causal, e.g. bilmédiakün ücün, biziniñ yaraltıkın yazıntokün ücün xagani ölti (BQ E16) 'Their ruler died on account of their ignorance and because they erred and sinned towards us'; täŋri
yarlıkakdkin üćün (KT S9) ‘by the grace of God’. In Uygur we find e.g.
ø[1 sakincigl sakintoklar üćün ayag kilinclari üstälür (MaitH XX
Endblatt r10) ‘Their sins increase because they think that [thought’]. In
the negative form e.g. körmәdokin üćün ‘because he didn’t see’
(Manichæan ms. Mz 372 r6 in Wilkens 2000: 136); / arig turug üćün
tanuka [...] barsar ymä ašayi artama[đo]k üćün mayrä burxan birfä
[tuş]p tamuluk ät’özintin ozar (Mait 220 r6) ‘Because he is pure he
will, even though he may go to hell, meet the Buddha Maitreya and, as
his data are not deteriorated, he will be saved from his hellbound body’.
Note that artamadok and yarlıkakdkin in the KT S9 example are both
accompanied by explicit subjects, but that the former has a possessive
suffix referring to the subject whereas artamadok doesn’t; this may be
a dialect characteristic or it may simply be due to the fact that äşöya is
not an individualized entity like täpri.

In Buddhist sources the post-terminal -mli ş üćün construction is more
common than -dOk üćün, e.g. kalmiş buyroklar ymä üküşi ažanlar da ...
öüğig kağıp tãpınışî udunîş üćün, burxan körkîn etîp virxar yerîn
sîpîrmiş üćün, nom esîlıp nom büyük biyîşi üćün, ñon ätük aš içği ñuşi
bermiş üćün ... arxantlar bohûlar (Mait 50 r1-8) ‘And the remaining
commanders become arhats because, through many existences, they
honoured and obeyed mother and father, adorned the ef
figy of Buddha
and swept the ground in chapels, listened to the teaching and wrote
down doctrinal texts and gave away clothes and shoes, food and drink
as alms.’ With possessive suffix referring to the subject, e.g. öŋädımîşin
üćün ‘since he had recovered’ (Yos 125).

The present participle -dAçî in a causal clause: bo montag așig tusu
kildêçi üćün bo nom ardîni, änîn ol šloklarîg tükâl bititti (BT I A 20)
‘It is because this jewel of a text does this much good that he (the
emperor) had those gähãs written out in full’. The aorist also belongs
to the group of participles supplying causes (and not to the group
expressing intention) although the state of affairs referred to with that
form did not yet actually have to have taken place at the time of the
utterance: arkiş barir üćün (UigBrief B) signifies ‘because a caravan is
going (there)’; i.e. the caravan is in planning or in preparation but has
not left as yet. Cf. körmäzi üćün ... at ôy mänxizig adírlayu körû umaz
(MaitH XV 8r26) ‘because he is blind he cannot distinguish objects and
appearances’.

In Manichæan sources there are a few instances where the
instrumental form added to -dOk with possessive suffix supplies
reasons for the main clause, e.g. azgurdokîn ‘because he led (our
senses) astray’ (Xw 19) or üzüti ozakî özkä ämgântökin, ... kop yerdu
ačığ ämgük körtökin ymä irinç kişi oglı ... atayurlar (M I 9.3-8) ‘because their soul suffered in their previous life, because they suffered bitter torments everywhere they call them ... poor sons of men’. The construction corresponds to -dökün ücün in Orkhon Turkic and -mlš ücün in later Uygur, which were dealt with above.

The suffix combination -mlš+kA is used for causal constructions in Buddhist texts: käk birlä katïglïg savlar köňülïntä ärmïşkä nay bo savlarïg bulgalï unazlär (BT II 990-992) ‘As there are matters mingled with hate in their heart, they are quite unable to attain these things’; män samtso ačarı birlä keç tušmïşkä burxan nomin şazïnïn keçïrtü umadïm (HTs VII 1295) ‘As I met master Xuanzang at a late stage (in my life), I was not able to spread Buddha’s teaching and practice’. In all such instances657 the subordinate clause precedes the main clause. The content of the causal clause can be taken up by anïn and/or by some equivalent phrase in the main clause: alku nomlarïg barcanï könisinçä ukmişkä, könisinçä tuymïşkä könisinçä körmïşkä anïn bo anvant tilägin män tägirikä uruqtï ... tep atïm täginür (Suv 540,17-23) ‘As I have correctly understood, correctly felt and correctly seen all dharmas, therefore, by this reason has my name been determined as “the gods’ general”’. Subjects of such forms are, where they are explicit, expressed either by nominals in the nominative, by possessive suffixes in the verb form or within a genitive construction (on account of -mlš being a perfect participle), having reference to the subject both in the genitive and in the possessive suffix of the verb form; the latter e.g. tört maxarac tägirïlärïng köyä közädä tutmišlarïna (MaitH XI 4v10) ‘as the four mahârâja-deities hold (him) under their protection’. Subjects of main and subordinate clauses can be either different or the same.

The negative counterpart of -mlš+kA is -mA-yok+kA which, in turn, is not attested without -mA-: män xwentsonuŋ kâčïm takï kâli täginmiyökðä ... ötig bitig kiliŋ ... ildu tâgïntïmir (HTsPek 89 r 5-11) ‘As my, Xuanzang’s, powers have not yet been restored, ... we endeavoured to prepare a petition and send it’. -mAyOkkA is attested either with subject in the nominative or with the subject appearing as genitive qualifier of the head (a perfect participle) together with reference to him in a possessive suffix. The subject of the form may be the same as that of the main clause, or the two may differ. There may also be a generalised subject, as in tägïrïkä yagiš aya[i]k] bermïyökðä

657 See further examples in Schulz 1978: 39-47; a few of the -mlš+kA clauses which he considers to be temporal can be interpreted as causal as well; since causal meaning is unquestioned for most of the clauses having this suffix, this is the meaning to be understood in all uncertain instances. See section 4.633 for the dative in temporal clauses.
baş[ın] közin agritur ‘When one does not offer sacrifices or vows to (a) god, it hurts one’s head and eyes’ (TT VII 25r1). In this last example the -yOk form could, of course, also be taken to be a headless relative clause referring to the subject, giving ‘People who don’t offer ... get pains in their head and eyes’.\(^{658}\)

-mAk+tln supplies reasons for matters recounted in the main clause: öjüj körküj täprämäkiñ bolmamaktïn ... ögïdï yükünç yaratgali kim tetingäy (ET§ 160,74-77) ‘In view of the fact that you have neither appearance nor motion, who would dare to write a stotra (on you)?’. bilgä bilig paramitliğ ögmäkimdin, birlä tugmiš buyan üzä bo tünliqlär bilgä bilig paramitliğ käcig üzä birtämläti ol kïdïga tïrk tïnzünlar (ET§ 160,82-85) ‘As a result of my praise for the virtue of wisdom, may the punya which arises therewith serve to get these creatures over the ford of the virtue of wisdom quickly and once and for all to peace on the other bank (i.e. nirvïna)’. With possessive suffix referring to the subject and a negative verb form: bo kamag öjï öjï nomlänïñ tüçülmäkimdin, öjï bolmamäkimdin, çïňžu tegmä ärtöktäg çïnkertii tözi nüj idï öjï ärmäjz (Suv 383,22-384,1) ‘Because all these different dhàrmas are parallel and not different, their so-being true root called çïnnüj is not different at all’. The following verse has a nominal ablative, two ablatives of -mAk and one of -dOk all expressing ‘reasons’: aðrokk säçmä sukançïg yeg tözlügünïn / etliñ kälgï terrïn tärïn bolmakïñdin / alp tuyguluk öşarguluk ärdökinïn / alko körmäk kör[mä]mäktïn sääilïr siz (ET§ 15,62-65) ‘You are special because you have a ... root ..., because you are ... deep, because feeling and comprehending you is hard (and) ... because you see everything and nothing.’

The causal meaning can be taken up by the instrumental anîn in the main clause, as in the following example, where ücïn governs a verbless clause with implicit topic: bo montag üküïš ädgelânïñ kapïgiü ücïn, anîn ... samtso açarï tadvaç tïlinçä agtardï (HTs VIII 46) ‘Because (it is) the gate of so many good things, therefore the master tripïnaka translated (it) into Chinese; nï ücïn bilmäzler tep tesär, kim ol ... kertï töz sözlügïlsüz nomlagulsuz ücïn, anîn anï bilmäzler (Suv 386-387) ‘If one asks why they do not know it, it is because the ...true root is unstatable and unteachable’, that is why they don’t know it’. With causal ablative: tugsar ymä yaljukta kïsilânïñ yerintä, yeg ayaglïg bolmäkitïn, anîn tïnri tep tetïrlä (Suv 550,17-21)

\(^{658}\) This latter is the translation proposed for the sentence by Röhrborn 2000: 269.
'Even though they are born among humans and in people's country, they are considered to be gods because they are eminently venerable'.

The causal clause is introduced by *kim* in the Suv example in the last paragraph as in the following sentence: *kertü yol orïk(k)a ögrünçüni tâgini, kim sızlär anî üçün okîmiþ boltuñüzler* (M III nr.7 III r4)

'Experience the true road with joy, as you have been called for (or 'because of') that'. In this last example the causal cause has no *üçün*, perhaps because there already is one *üçün* within the clause. Thus the whole subordinating task is borne by the conjunction *kim* in this case.

Similarly in *annâmana kulügü bo üd kolo ... tâki kulügü bo yer oron kim bodisatwañ bo koloda bo yer oronta ... ulag sapag nomug sakîntîlar* 'This time and this place are (so) blessed because the bodhisattvas have thought about the law of causation at this time and place!' (MaitH XV 6r5; there is another such sentence in 6v6). The author is here linking a state (blessedness) with an event, but the direction of inference is not clear: It may be that the time and place are blessed because of the mental-theological achievement of the bodhisattvas, or the writer may be giving his justification for stating that they are blessed. However, consecutive clauses (section 4.63) are also introduced by *kim*; the second clause may be consecutive and not causal if the writer is stating that the bodhisattvas perceived the chain of cause and effect as a result of the blessedness of that particular time and place.

The sentence quoted above from M III nr.7 III could also have been translated with relative *kim*, as 'Experience the true road with joy, you who have been invited for that purpose'. The following sentence is translated with a relative subordinate clause in UW 122a: *ymâ yegâdmâk utmâk bolzun mağa agdok karî petkâçî mar içayan mazistâk üzâ, kim ymâ ulag amranmakin agîr küsîşin bitidim* (M I 28,21) "... der ich [dieses Buch] mit großer Verehrung und mit gewaltigem Eifer geschrieben habe". The clause could, however, be causal as well: 'May I, the worthless old scribe, prevail everlastingly through his holiness the mazistâk L., since I have written it with great love and serious effort'.

In Orkhon Turkic direct speech subordinated by *te-yín* 'saying' can in fact introduce a causal clause: *arkış üdmaz teyín sülädim* (BQ E25) ‘I campaigned (against them) because they were not sending (tribute) caravans’ (lit. ‘saying “he is not sending caravans”’); another such instance, also with an aorist, appears in BQ E39. Not far from this meaning is a sentence in Tuñ 24: *aqar ayitîp bir altîg barmiş teyín ol yolun yorîsar unîc teðîm* ‘I asked him; since (teyín ‘saying’) a rider had gone (there) it will be possible (for us) to go by that way, I said.’ Other
Orkhon Turkic clauses subordinated by teyin (which all have volitional form) are all final.

4.636. Final clauses
In section 4.633 we saw that the form in -gAll has a temporal meaning, sometimes called ‘abtemporal’ (of stating that what is referred to in the main clause happened since the events of the -gAll clause). The other important function of -gAll converbs is in final clauses, which state that the content of the converbial clause is the aim of the action referred to in the main clause. Such clauses usually have the same subject as the main clause, e.g. in sığar sūsi avığ barkīg yulgalī bardī, sığar sūsī sīnüşgālī kāltī (BQ E 32) ‘Half of their army went to plunder the houses, half their army came to fight (against us)’; the phrase sīnüşgālī kālt- appears also in sizlārni birlā sīnüşgālī kālyök mān (U IV 82) ‘I have come to fight against you’ and yükkā sīnüşgālī kāltī ‘he came to fight the devil(s)’ (Xw 3). Cf. further aşagalā olormışlar (MI 35,14-15) ‘They sat down to have a meal’ and ölğālī yat- ‘to lie down to die’. In anandaširi altğ toynkā amtık nomlarnîn tamlgasîn oyrtgalî aŋa kārgāklig yevakin anı barča tukāl anutup (BT XIII 45.2.11) ‘(he) prepared all implements necessary in order to commission the carving of the printing blocks of the present books by the monk named Anandašı’ the instigator of the carving is also the person making the preparations (anut-). Main and -gAll clause agent identity holds for 20 Manichæan examples collected in Zieme 1969: 163-4 and more than 15 Buddhist ones collected in Schulz 1978: 114-115. The function of -gAll thus corresponds to that of the English infinitive; I would not (thinking, e.g., of Latin dicere) for this reason call this form an ‘infinitive’, however, as in Nevskaya 2002.

Rarely, final clauses with differing subject can appear as complements, e.g. bizni sini algalī ʁdðī ‘He sent us to fetch you’; in kavişgālī ʁd- in HTs IV 968-969 and tîlāgālī ʁd- in Suv 636,10-12 the subject of the -gAll verb also differs from that of ʁd-. Our interpretation of Tuñ 27 depends on whether there as well -gAll can have a subject different from the main verb: The sentence can be read either as așangalî tūšūrtümû ‘We had (them) dismount to have (their) meal’ or as sanagalî tūšūrtümû ‘We had (them) dismount to count (them)’. For the first interpretation there would be two different agents (those who tell others to dismount and the eaters), though in fact the agents wouldn't have been wholly distinct because the commanders would also dismount and eat.
In section 4.23 I dealt with complex verbal phrases incorporating the -gAll form but showing no final or temporal content nor expressing such categories as actionality, ability, politeness etc.; those involving the verb sakÎn-, also mentioned there, are border cases: With yarmangalÎ sakÎn- ‘to plan to climb’, e.g., the climbing could be considered to be the aim of the planning, as going is the aim of the begging in bargalÎ ötÎn- ‘to beg to go’ (HTs VII 1883). If a phrase like this is nominalised we get

When ûcÎn governs clauses with nominal predicates it usually has causal meaning. However, the example ögÎ ka'utluglar ûcÎn ävirt-(BT II 114 and elsewhere in that text) is in its context to be understood, I think, as ‘to have (it) translated (or: to have punyâ deflected) so that his parents would be blessed’, i.e. with final force.

The meaning of the sequence -gAll ûcÎn seems to be similar to that of -gAll by itself: ançakya oglanturÎgali ûcÎn bir ulug sögÎt üzÎa agÎnÎp butÎkÎnÎn yalÎpÎgÎkÎnÎn sip alÎp ol balÎk üzÎa ürtÎp köșiÎgÎkÎlÎp ... (Suv 601,22-602,2) ‘so as to bring them (the fish) back a bit to their senses he climbed a big tree and broke and took its branches and leaves and spread them out above the fish, created a shade (over them)’, tÎnlÎglÎnÎn köÎnülÎlÎn korÎktÎgali ûcÎn (Mait 113r6) ‘in order to frighten creatures’ hearts’ or tag sÎnÎrÎn yemÎrganÎlÎ ûcÎn ulug tîyÎn âîözÎn bÎlgurÎtÎp ... (Mait 60 r 4-8) ‘so as to shatter the promontory he brought forth the figure of a large monk and ...’

Both by appearance and by meaning, -gAll ûcÎn is very similar to the equally common phrase with -gAllÎr ûcÎn, in such examples as elig bÎgÎkÎa âîözÎn sÎvÎtgÎlÎr ûcÎn (U III 54,17) ‘so as to get herself (physically) loved by the king’, brazÎnÎka altÎn yarÎmÎkÎr bergÎlÎr ûcÎn ‘so as to give gold coins to the brahman’ (U III 68,29) or katÎg katÎgî ... köÎnülÎgÎ tÎnlÎglÎrÎgÎ yavÎlturÎgÎlÎr ûcÎn (Mait fol.171r4-10) ‘in order to subdue creatures with a hard heart’. Other uses of -gAllÎr and its possible origin are discussed in section 3.285. In Mait 132r13 the longer and the shorter verb alternate: tÎnÎrÎ tÎnÎrÎsÎr burxan [... mayÎÎrÎnÎn adÎgÎsun ärdÎmÎn [üîkÎsÎ tÎnlÎglÎkÎr üÎntÎnÎ açÎgÎlÎr [...] bÎlgurÎtgÎlÎr ûcÎn, sanîz tümÎn tÎnlÎglÎkÎr burxan kutÎnÎ usÎg kÎsÎsÎ turgurÎgÎlÎ ûcÎn, kÎp kÎlÎn tÎnlÎglÎkÎr (thus?) tÎzÎn mayÎtÎ bîdÎsÎavÎt bîrlÎ sokuÎsturÎgÎlÎ ûcÎn ... ‘in order to put open and show ... in order to
evoke a yearning towards Buddhahood ... in order to make ... meet righteous bodhisatta Maitreyä'. -gAll(ü) ćün may have been created to make the final content of the clauses explicit; -gAll is clearly not explicit, as it also has a number of other functions and meanings.

The equally non-factive -gU+kA (Uygur and Qarakhanid) signifies ‘so as to (do or obtain something)’, giving a final meaning to the clause built around it. While -gAll and the other means with final content discussed hitherto practically always have the subject of the main and subordinate clauses identical, subjects of -gUkA mostly differ from those of the main clause. With no subject expressed or referred to we find, e.g.: anïn ... bo stupug etär män änätökä nom urguka (HTs VII 1773) ‘Therefore I erect this temple for placing Indian books into it’. With subject in the nominative: altun önlüg yarok yaltraklik kopta kötrülmis bo nom ärdinig üzaliksiz on külcü ugrayu uktu nomladim sizlär kamag törtägü uzatı küyü kőzüdä utguka (Suv 451,19-452,2) ‘This Suvarnaprabhásotamasūtra I, the one with the unsurpassable ten powers, have taught and preached especially so that all four of you would keep and guard it for a long time’. As -gU is a projection participle suffix, the agent of the (here negative) -gU+kA form can also be introduced through a genitive construction: arig braman ugušiniğ ariçi üzülmiğüsiniğ ædörlig odgurük âzrua tämrä ok küç berü (BT III 183-185) ‘It was clearly and obviously the god Brahma himself659 who gave the power so that the pure Brahmin caste would in no way be cut off’. In the following instance the context would appear to indicate that the agent of the main clause and of -gUkA should be one and the same: abavapur atülg nirvanä balikka kirgükä aïg başünkä yeti kîrk köngül örtüdylär (BT III 445-448) ‘So as to enter the nirvâna city called Abhavapura they will call forth the 37 very first attitudes’.

In the following passage -gUkA and -gU ćün are used in parallel manner: kalisiz nizvanlarig altguka, kalisiz biligisiz biligil tarkargu ćün nizgä aşıygü adrokları ârsar tînlüglärka nomlayu yarlikazun (BT VIII B 34-36) ‘In order to get the passions completely destroyed, in order to get ignorance completely removed, may he deign to preach to living beings any sorts of aşıygü characteristics he possesses’. sizni körgü ćün ‘in order to see you’ in Pothi 96 seems to be another instance of this latter construction.

Here is an instance of -gULXk ćün: bo sâkiz ulug örtülg tämular agir tsaylug yazoklug tînlüglärka kiyi(j)ın kîzgut ... kilgülük ćün hâlgülüg

659 Thus if we read ök. Another possibility is to read òg and translate ‘give sense and power’.
bolmiš ärürlär (Mait 81v3, MaitH XXV 3r21) ‘These eight great fiery hells have come into existence for carrying out punishment ... to creatures with grave sins’.

tep ‘saying’ subordinates not only direct speech and content of thought (as discussed in section 4.7) but also intentions, thus being a conjunction for final clauses: maytri burxanka tusalim tep bir maytri suu bazađimiz ‘We have had the Maitreya prologue embellished in the hope of meeting (or ‘so as to meet’) Buddha Maitreya’. With the tep clause to the right of the main clause we have bo iki yeğirmi törlüg törösz užakar birigärig ol biligsiz infiğlar tutular, adasız tudasız ärülm tep (TT VI 260) ‘Those ignorant creatures observe these twelve types of untraditional texts and writings hoping to keep away from harm’ or üzü ki yarok tärlär yarlığiňa kadı inärär, kamag budunka oglari täg kölayi täg boljun tep (TT VI 253) ‘Following the word of the bright gods above they come down, so as to be for the whole people like their mother and father’. Another instance with -zUn appears in MaitH XX 14r25. Note that the TT VI 260 sentence is more of a stretch of direct speech in that its verb is in the 1st person plural, reflecting the subjects’ speech; the 3rd person singular of TT VI 260 is a mark of subordination as it would have given the wrong meaning if it had been uttered by the subjects.

Very similar final clauses were already formed in Orkhon Turkic with teyin; here is one among the examples: bodun tug igidäyin teyin yirïgaru oguz bodun tapa, ilgärü kitañ tabi bodun tapa, birigärü tavgač tapa ulug sü eki yeğirmi sülädim … (KT E28, BQ E23) ‘In order to feed the people I raided against the Oguz people in the north, the Kitañ and Tatbi peoples in the east and the Chinese in the south’. Orkhon Turkic also already has an example of tep in this function: anï añïtayïn tep sülädim ‘I campaigned in order to intimidate him’ (BQ E41). All the Orkhon Turkic examples for this construction (see the index of Tekin 1968) have volitional verb forms in the subordinate verb; this appears to be so also in Uygur. Orkhon Turkic teyin governing an aorist gives causal meaning.

Final clauses can also be subordinated by kim. We find two constructions here, depending on whether the content is indicative or not. If the speaker does not express the wish that the result may take place, this resultant situation is expressed with the conditional: adgïg ayigïg ymä kertgäniş kargak, kim ken oğünñasär (TT VI 199) ‘One must also believe in good and bad, so that one is not sorry afterwards’; ymä ögi kañ antag ögïk sav sölâyï umagay kim ol ärn(i) kölin
Moreover his parents will not be able to say such considerate words as would enlighten that man’s heart’. The speaker may also wish the content of one of two projected situations to materialize so that the content of the second (which he equally hopes for) may also come true. We find that this content is expressed by linking two volitional clauses:

\[
\text{oy tülnü• tüš in ada rtlayu b eri•lär kim kamag yal•uklar ešizünlär} \quad (\text{MaitH XI 3r4})
\]

‘Please give (pl.) details on the portent of that dream so that all humans may hear (it)’. With the polite 3rd person imperative used for the 2nd person we have

\[
\text{bo kutsuz kovî tünlügålar üçîn târs hîlgîn ayîg kilînîn ketürmûk alîn caviîn yarlîkazun, tâyîrim, kim ukzun hîlûnîn} \quad (\text{TT VI 20-21})
\]

‘May he, my lord, for the sake of these unhappy and wretched creatures tell us the means to remove their heresies and sins so that they may understand and know’. The following, in an address to Buddha, is similar (it also appears in the same text, TT VI), but both the main and the subordinate clauses get the preterite of the copula (presumably for politeness’ sake):

\[
\text{amtî, tâyîrim, bo monag târs tâyî hîlgîlgå tumolgå ka köni yol orok kîrîgtürû bergây ärti, kim köni yolîa, köni hîlgêa yorîzunlar ärti, târs tâyrû törö kodzunlar ärti} \quad (\text{TT VI 237-8})
\]

‘I wish you would now, my lord, graciously show such perversely thinking creatures the right way, so that they would walk along the right road and according to the right set of mind and should give up perverse teachings’.

Afrin •or, the Manichæan poet, used morphological instead of syntactic means to present the same content: He also linked two volitional clauses but put the 3rd person imperative form of the first into the instrumental case, using what I take to be the blends yarlîkazunîn (the same verb as found in the TT VI instance just quoted) and berzûnîn. The passage has already been quoted and commented upon in section 3.231 above.

4.637. Consecutive clauses

Consecutive clauses, with which the speaker describes the result of the main clause or its justification, are generally construed analytically, with the conjunction kim. Orkhon Turkic does not have this conjunction; it might have had other means for forming consecutive clauses, but no such clauses happen to be attested in those sources. kim is also (among other tasks) used for introducing causal clauses; section 4.635 quoted a sentence whose subordinate clause could be interpreted either as causal or as consecutive. In

\[
\text{nà mug ûk bolû kim antag täyîri tâg ärdînî tâg ögûkûnîzînî ölûm yerînî idûr sûz!} \quad (\text{KP 24,1-4})
\]

‘What

\[660\text{ Archaically spelled YRWTsr.} \]
calamity has taken place that you are sending such a jewel-like, god-like darling of yours to a place of death!' the superordinate clause is a rhetorical question.

In the following sentence the *kim* clause is also consecutive and has a structure similar to the one just quoted: *née kärgäk bolti kim ança ängänip bo verkä kältiŋž?* ‘What necessity arose that you went to the trouble to come to this place?’ (KP 47,3). Thus also in *bo ṭinliŋlar nä ayig kälintç kilmistišlar ärki, kim bo montag æžuna ðugup ...* ‘What sin are these creatures said to have committed, that they were born into such an existence and ...?’ (MaitH XX 1v20) and *kimlär ärki bolar? nä ayig kälintç kiltišlar ärki, kim montag yürük yarlintçig ängäk tolgak tåginürlär?* (MaitH XXV 2v21) ‘Who might these be? What sin might they have committed, that they experience such heart-rending suffering?’.

The main and subordinate clauses of these two Mait examples have their subjects in common, so that one can see how they could have evolved from relative clauses with *kim*.

I have come across one instance of what I take to be a synthetic consecutive clause; its verb has the verb suffix -gál, which is otherwise used with final or temporal meaning or as supine: In *kimni üçtin mini montag ängägtäli bûsï bertîŋž?* (DKPAMPb 840) ‘For whom have you given me as alms to cause me so much pain?’ I take *mini montag ängä-* to be not the aim but the result of the main action; this is what the context seems to demand.

### 4.64. Conditional and concessive sentences

The conditional construction uses the verb ending in -sAr in the subordinate clause, other sorts of causal relations being equally expressed by conversal means. It signifies ‘if’, e.g. in *agï barïm alkinsar el törö näcük ṭuŋar bîz* ‘If the treasures were used up, how would we uphold the state?’ (KP 9,2); *ol altun tagka tågsîr siz, kök lenxwa körgäy siz* ‘If you reach that golden mountain you will see blue lotuses’ (KP 38,1). Contextual conversals can occasionally have conditional meaning, e.g. *yanmiša oglanlarînmî bulmatîn yalanîz älvîrğû tîg bolar mân* (BT XIII 2,47) ‘If I do not find find my children when I come back, all alone I would get insane’. One could, of course, have translated as ‘Not finding my children ... I would get insane’, but the

---

661 Ellipse of the main clause is possible, e.g. in *sakĩnu tågiŋsîr bîz* ‘If we presume to think (about it)’. This comes to introduce a train of reasoning in HTs VII 231. A highly common ellipse occurs with *née ñüsîn tep x̌akr*, literally ‘If one says “Why?”: This is used as when one says, in English ‘Why? Because ...’ as a rhetorical figure.
meaning remains conditional. In *kim ayğ kilingliglar bo nomug arvişig
nomlaglı nomçig örlätgalı sakinc sakinsar, bo arvişig sözläzün* (TT VI
374) ‘If any wrongdoers have the intention of annoying the teacher
preaching this teaching and spell, let him pronounce this spell’ the
subject of the protasis is qualified by the indefinite human pronoun *kim.*

The -sAr form can also signify ‘seeing that’ (or ‘inasmuch as’), e.g.
*täry basmasar, yer tâlinmäsär; türk bodun, elinîn törögün käm arTaii
udacê ârti?* (KT IE22) ‘Seeing that the sky has not pressed down (upon
you and) the earth has not opened (beneath you), oh Turk nation, who
could have been able to destroy your land and your government?’
Similarly in Buddhist Mait XV 10r6:662 ayagka tägimlig mayri
bodisavi ... *äzi t(a)ršanč(a)rîti ärsär ymä yîti slikî bilîgä bilîgän ulag
sapîg nomug tetrî körüp ... ‘In as much as he is himself a
daršanacarîjä (one who has attained insight), the venerable bodhisattva
Maitreya with his sharp wisdom also sees clearly the rule of causation
and ...’. In such sentences the truth of the protasis is presupposed.

Sometimes we come across concessive use, such content being made
explicit only by the meaning of the lexemes used and by the pragmatic
demands of the context; e.g. with *boşgunsarlar tînasarlar* in *bo
innelun şastr ärsär ârtijä tärij alp täpkärgülük ârur; yînçga yörlügen
kim bar ârsär têtglär keg bilîgîglîr boğgunsarlar tînasarlar ükäsîn
bîlî umazlar* (HTs VIII 155) ‘As for this Ying ming lun şärê, it is
exceedingly profound and hard to fathom; even if any of the clever and
broad-minded people study it or listen to it, they cannot understand
most of its subtle definitions.’ With *ymä ‘also’ the meaning can be a bit
different: *savi az ârsär ymä tözüg kenyürdäci ârur* (HTs VIII 37)
‘Although its words are few, it is an exposition of the (central)
principle’. The following sentence, with *u-ma-* in the main clause as in
the previous HTs example and with an indefinite pronoun in the
conditional clause, is clearly also concessive: *ymä nâcâ otäq otîn bîrlü
câlsär anî otayu umagay* (M I 15,7) ‘Even if any number of doctors
come with their herbs they will be unable to cure him’. Qarakhanid
nâcâ mâ compares with *ymânâcâ* of the Manichaean example: *nâcâ mâ
ulîsa* (QB 1371) ‘however much he howls’; *nâcâ mâ oprak kâdîk ärsä,
yagmurka yarar* (DLT fol.461) ‘However shabby and worn it (a cloak)
may be, it is useful against rain’. Schinkewitsch 1926: 77 quotes a
number of concessive clauses introduced by *nâcâ mâ* from Rabgûzî.
There is no need to make ‘concessive clauses’ into a special

662 The doubts expressed by the editors in footn.39 to the translation of the text are
groundless; there is no problem around this use of the conditional form.
grammatical class in Uygur, (as done e.g. by Ş. Tekin 1965: 49-50), as there are no clear-cut formal means of expression put to use for this purpose, and as ‘although’, ‘even if’, ‘seeing that’, ‘inasmuch as’ etc. are distinguished mainly by context. Still, as e.g. Ş. Tekin’s examples in the passage mentioned show, -şAr ymä is a fairly dependable sign of concessive use in Uygur, while concessive clauses appear to have often been introduced by nāčä má in Muslim sources. What is common to all these contents is that the subordinate clause spells out a presupposition.

-şAr forms can also introduce temporal clauses, as documented in section 4.633. This is generally the case when the context allows only a factive interpretation. In other cases, some of them quoted in that section, both a temporal and a conditional interpretation of the clauses is possible, and the difference seems to be blurred. Here is one such sentence allowing both interpretations: turmiš törö ol: bo kunčunnyň bümä yakín bolmasar amranmak niýan olarni artokrak örlätür ‘It is an established rule: Whenever / If the husbands of these women are away, the passion of lechery excites them a lot’ (U III 81.25).

Conditional clauses are sometimes introduced by apam ‘now’ (apay in Qarakhaniid), kačän ‘at some point in time’, kalti ‘if, for instance’ or (only Uygur) birök ‘however’. Sometimes we find the elements kalı or k(al)tı opening conditional clauses; kalti appears to signify ‘for one’ in kalti birök altun tilgänlig çakravart elığän xanlar nāčakä tägi yertinëüdü [äsärär, änäka tägi] yetä ärdiniläri ymä yitilməüzär yokadnazar, kačän birök çakravart elig kaça kiyülgüçä ārsär, ötö yetä ärdiniläri ymä özün ök yitlinüür xur yuradurlar (Suv 395,12-17) ‘As long as, for one, the golden wheeled çakravartin kings are on earth, their seven diamonds will not disappear; if, however, a çakravartin king should, at any time, be about to go and die, then his seven diamonds will also by themselves be annihilated’. The following passages have more than one of these particles: apam birök bo ăt özümän titsär män, ötö ... barçamä titmiš idalmiš bolur män (Suv 614,15) ‘Now if I should give up this body of mine, however, I would then have given up and renounced everything’; Here is a conditional sentence with kalı from DLT fol.548: külçä kalı kağılık, ärtär teyü tirängil ‘If hardships should come, say it will pass and be steadfast’.

The second sentence of the Suv passage just quoted has the construction (birök) ... -şUČA ārsär ‘If it gets to the point that ... happens’, cf. also birök tükäš [bılgü]čä ukgüçä ārsär (HTs VIII 156).

---

663 Not as the time adverb but corresponding to the English particle which is its homophone; German nun. Nevertheless apam may come from ap+am, < *an ‘now’.
In case, however, one should reach the level of knowing (it) and understanding it fully ...'. In Suv 533,15 the Skt. Petersburg ms. has uksarlar where an (older) Berlin ms. writes uk-u u-guča ārsārlār. Cf. further: birōk ol küsāmīš küsāši kannamguča ārsār ikiyā yana ašnuki törōcā kiluṣ; kačan küsāsī kanguča ārsār ... (Suv 362,14) 'In case his wish should not attain fulfillment, however, let him carry out the mentioned procedures again; if, at some point, it turns out that his wish does reach fulfillment ...; bodisātvala mahāsātvala munčulayu hīlgučā ārsārlār ... (Suv 204,2) 'Insofar as the bodhisattvas and mahāsattvas are as knowledgable as this, ...'.

In the instances mentioned above, there was either -sAr added to verbal stems or ārsār added to nominals or to the -gUčA form. -sAr is aspectually unmarked; complex forms are used for specification. If the event being referred to precedes the moment of speaking or the time of the main event, ārsār is added to a -dI form: annarak oglmū olī ārsār munuq yuṣūn ymā kōrmāyīn (KP 67,7) 'If my dear son has died, let me not see the face of this (other) one'. The aorist followed by ārsār brings an outlook for the future: yarlıq bolmaz ārsār bo yerdā yatayīn (KP 19,7) 'If no command should be forthcoming, let me lie down in this place'; yok ārsār instead of bolmaz ārsār would have concerned the speaker's present. With the following instance the speaker is applying to a sort of oracle: yantarū purulūsūn[k]a barī adasīz āsān tāig ārsār mān, bo xuālīg psak bod[isaty]nīn̄ idok elgintā turzūn (HTs III 919) 'If I am to return to my own country and arrive there safe and sound, may this wreath cling to the bodhisattva (statue)'s holy hand'. Numerous examples for -mIš ārsār are mentioned in UW 403b (§19e of the entry), e.g. abidarīm tāŋrī burxan yarlıgāmiš ārnāsār (Abhi A 84a11) 'If the divine Buddha had not created abhidharma, ...'. The negative counterpart of -mIš is -mAdOk: köz ārklig artamadok ārsār (Abhi B 64a12) 'If the sense of sight has not gotten impaired, ...'.

When the condition is irreal, the main verb has to be followed by ār-ti; the subordinate clause normally shows -dI ārsār (or other appropriate persons of the preterite form):665 birōk agar sızlār kārgōk boltuqzlar ārsār sızɭrnlī əlgəy ārdī (U III 69,25) 'If it had turned out

---

664 Another example for -gUčA ārsār is attested in HTs III 713. The Suv uses the construction with ār- in 376,4 and 14, with aii- in 86,13 and 99,19, with sözɭ- in 537,5, with bol- in 376,8, with tug- in 374,17,19 and 22, with ornangalī u- in 462,6, with yadī- in 91,21 and with yolat- in 87,22. Cf. also UW 407a.

665 In Turkish -sA idī or Rabgīz' -sA árdī (documented by Schinkewitsch 1926: 93 § 148) irreax conditions are instead expressed by the conditional of the lexical verb and the preterite of the copula.
that he needed you (pl.), he would have fetched you (but in fact it was me whom he snatched away). A sentence with -mAdl ärsär in the subordinate clause and -mAdIlAr ärti in the main clause appears in MaithI 1v7-12. A further irreal sentence, with bulmadılar ärsär and bolgay ärti, is quoted in UW 405a. In the following the main clause contains a 3rd person imperative, because the speaker would have liked the proposition to come true: älíti kälmİş azokİ alkanmaEl ärsär, yersuva uzun ya saEl ärsär üküEl şadı sızı bırla körzIIn ärti (M III nr.5 9-12) ‘If the provisions which he brought along had not been used up, if he had lived a long life on earth, he would have enjoyed a lot of happiness together with you (but unfortunately he died)’.

The sentence can be irreal even if the subordinate verb is not preterite, if the then operative condition is still considered to be valid at the time of speaking: kutlug bodis(a)vtlar ärmaEär bo yerka nIIn tögmaEgy ärti (KP 45,3-5) ‘If he weren’t a blessed bodhisattva he would not have been able to reach this place at all (but in fact he did)’. Three further instances with the same sets of verb phrases are quoted in UW 404-5 (§23a of the entry). This holds already, with the forms kazganmasar, in Orkhon Turkic Tuñ 59: Elteriš xagan kazganmasar, yok ärtI ärsär, bın özım bilgI Tuñokok kazganmasar bin yok ärtIm ärsär, Kapgan xagan Türk Sir bodIIn yerIInI bod ymI bodIn yemI kIšI yemI idI yok ärtIçi ärtI ‘If Elteriš kagan were not victorious, if he had perished, if I myself, the wise Tuñokok, were not victorious, if I had perished, there would not have remained any nation or tribe or person in the place of the Türk Sir nation’. The unrealised future in the past appears in the main clauses of all such sentences in Orkhon Turkic and Uygur.

If the subject of a -sAr form is evident from the context, it may not be overtly expressed at all, e.g. the second sentence in esän tükal töggaI sız inçıp kayu kän burxan kuṭIn bulsars, meni titmaI (KP 40,7) ‘You will arrive safe and sound. If (you) thereupon some day attain Buddhahdom, do not forsake me’. Uygur -sAr forms with no explicit subject can also have a general agent, ‘one’ in English: tužI tayeI yerIInIki yIl sænE sænasars ... tört müy yIIn ärtI ‘if one reckons by the years of the TušIta country of the gods 4000 years ... have passed’; tišI kišIInI yIInI sanaI ärsär bisamīIni bašIap sanaI ol (TT VII nr.12,3) ‘If one is to count the years of a female person (i.e. for astrological purposes) one must count by starting from Vaiśravaṇa’. There is an important difference between generic reference, which applies to ‘anyone’, and general reference, which applies to ‘everyone’, as described in the next section; the first remains unexpressed while generalised reference is expressed by indefinite pronouns. In Blatt 14-
18 and 27-28 we have both gapping and käm ‘whoever’: kaltï yürüŋ tašag palsar, kïzïlsïg sïv yïnsïr ol tašïg Ýïizi ßïzïr ßïtsar kïlïppa utgay …

If one takes the white stone, for instance, and there emerges a reddish liquid and one keeps that stone on oneself one will prevail at everything. … If the liquid of the stone should be green, whoever keeps it with himself, poisonous worms and beetles will not be able to endanger him’. In the second sentence a conditional clause and the correlative type of sentence described in the next section appear in parallel, making a fitting link between this and that one.

If the speaker wants the addressee to make the content of the protasis come true, he can – as in many other languages – put it into the imperative mood, thereby making a merely implicit condition: bir âki atlïg yavlakïn Ýïizïn ßïrâh bïðïüm olïtïn yetïïh; yïaï iïïci, Ýïïmïci yeïtmäcci sän (ŠU E5) ‘Because of the wickedness of one or two knights you perished, o my people; submit again and (if you do that) you will neither die nor perish’. The standard conditional formulation would have been *yïaï iïïci (sän), Ýïïmïci yeïtmäcci sän The meaning of the following sentence, with næcä but without the conditional form, is close to being concessive: bo mamïka kïzïni Ýïizïi yïmï bïksiß mänïissïi sïl, næcä yïmï körtï Ýïïincä mänïizi ol (TT X 545) ‘Now the body of this girl Mamika is as weak and transient as her shape and appearance is beautiful.’ This is a way of saying that her body is transient although she is beautiful. tömgässï Ýïizïn in Mait 2r2 (tömgässï Ýïizïn in parallel MaitH Y 11a6) is by the context shown to signify ‘even though they are foolish’ and not ‘because they are foolish’. If this is not an error on the part of the writer, it shows that matters which are ‘not a hindrance’ could also be represented by the causal postposition.

4.65. Correlative relativisation

Uygur (like many other Turkic languages) has a two-clause sentence pattern in which the subordinate clause contains or consists of an interrogative-indefinite pronoun and a verb form in sAr, to which there is explicit (demonstrative) or implicit resumptive reference in the main clause. Constructions consisting of an indefinite pronoun + ärsär with no correlate, as in Ýïzlïg olïrïïp kïmïkä ärsär ädgï Ýïizïr umaz (U IV C122-3) ‘One cannot do good to anybody by killing living beings’ are discussed in section 3.134 (on interrogative-indefinite pronouns).

---

666 Accusative suffix with vowel lowered by the /g/; see section 2.402.
The construction has two distinct uses: In what appears to have been the primary use, the pronoun serves as a variable argument, the content of the main clause being understood to apply for any value of that variable. It would be wrong to speak of a relative pronoun in such cases, as that would obscure the indefinite – generalising meaning of this element. The resulting content is equivalent to generalising relativisation. In the second use, the variable has only one value, referred to by the demonstrative of the main clause. The adverbial use of indefinite – demonstrative correlations, e.g. when the subordinate clause has nācā here meaning ‘in the measure that’, are again a different matter, dealt with last in this section.

A simple example for the first use mentioned above is Qarakhanid tavar kimnīgūklišā bāglik aḡar kārgāyūr ‘Whoever acquires much wealth, being a bāğ befits him’. The variable is the possessor of the subject (tavar ‘wealth’) in the subordinate clause but the dative object in the main clause; kimnīg and aḡar are correlated. The main proposition is said to hold for whatever person’s fortune grows (ūkli-). The content can also be translated into a conditional construction: ‘If anybody acquires much wealth, it befits him to become a bāğ’. Similarly in talkan kimnīg bolsa aḡar bākmās katar (DLT fol. 221) ‘He who has roasted barley mixes it with syrup’. Here the main and subordinate clauses share the subject in English though not in Qarakhanid: In the sentence as it stands, aḡar refers back not to kimnīg but to talkan. Uygur: kimnīg tamarī yogun bolsar kanagī yenīl (TT VII 42,3) ‘If somebody has thick veins, it is easy to let his blood’ and kimkā birōk kertginē bar ārsār ol kīši temin čin kīši tētir (TT V B 112-113) ‘Whoever possesses faith, however, that person is straightway called a true person’. An instance of a correlation kimnīg ... aniği appears in TT X 273-274. kimkā is attested in a correlative sentence in U III 76,16. Interestingly, the majority of the instances with oblique indefinite pronouns in the conditional clause of this construction are construed around kim ‘who’ and not any other interrogative–indefinite pronoun, no doubt because of the saliency of humans above other entities.

In the examples quoted, the indefinite pronoun was in the genitive, the locative or the dative case. Normally, it is in the nominative case and (perhaps for that reason) often appears at the beginning of the subordinate clause; this is not surprising as this relative element of the subordinate clause is normally also the subject of the main clause: kim

---

667 Dissimilated from kınnin, the genitive form, as happens in the DLT.
‘Whoever is a murderer, he will himself suffer the result of that sin’. birök ‘however’ is used also here, e.g. kim birök töüri burxannay bir pt(a)đakča täňlig nom bilir ārsar, ol kālip elig bägkā sözlažun (U III 29,16) ‘However, let anybody who knows even as little as one line of the divine Buddha’s teaching come and tell it to the king’. In kim mintū ken okīsar mini atayu yarlīkasunlar (M I 29,16-30,18) ‘May whoever recites it after me graciously evoke my name’ the plural form of the main verb reflects the assumption that the text will be recited by more than one person; there is no resumptive pronoun here, this plural suffix in fact taking care of anaphoric reference. Cf. təloj ŏgūţkā kirūr sizlār. kim ölüm adaka korksar yörüğlar (KP 32,3), which signifies ‘You are entering the ocean. If anyone (of you) is afraid of death or danger, you may leave’; or: ‘Any one (of you) who is afraid of death or danger may leave’.

With kayu we have e.g. kayu korkinçsiž yīŋak ārsar ol yīŋakta turkaru bizni uduzup eldıŋ (U IV C 83) ‘Whichever was the fearless direction, in that direction did you always lead us’; the word kayu in this example is not adnominal but the predicate of a downgraded nominal sentence whose topic is korkinčsiž yīŋak.

In the examples quoted, the variable consisted of the interrogative-indefinite pronoun by itself; it may also be a noun phrase containing such a pronoun (nāgü sakınč and nā busuš in the following two examples): nāgü sakınč sakînsar sîn, bûtmüz (TT VII 28,4) ‘Whatever plans you are considering, they will not materialize’. In aŋtī kōŋūlūŋdâki nā busušuy sakınčuy ārsar ... irak tarkargil (TT X 136) ‘Get rid of any sorrow or worry there is in your heart ...’ we have the verb ār- here expressing existence. Note that there was no resumptive pronoun in the main clause in these examples.668 With an abnominal indefinite pronoun and a correlate in the main clause, e.g. kayu kiši ďag kaŋ köľin bertsâr, ol tînlîg tamuluk bolur (KP 9,5) ‘Any person who breaks the heart of his parents, that creature becomes a candidate for hell’. When the speaker assumes that more than one entity answers the description he gives, he can take up reference to them in the plural in his subsequent text (as already in two previously quoted examples for this construction): kim yerči suveči kâmiči bar ārsar, ymā kâlzun, tēning āsîn tûkâl kâlürzûnlîr (KP 23,4-7) ‘Whatever guides, pilots or seamen there are, let them come, then, and bring the prince back safe and

668 Therefore, ol in the U IV example just quoted need not be resumptive with reference to the murderer but could also qualify the phrase ayîg kîlinč.
sound’. This construction has been called the ‘internally headed strategy’ of relativization, as the antecedent appears within the relative and not within the main clause.

Generalising indefinite-interrogative pronouns can be combined in parallel manner: kayu năcă uług eliglärkä xanlarka yazmiş ölümcülär ārsär ... kayu năcă ačmaq suvsamaq âmgâkin âlağrümüş koğşamış tînlîglar ārsär ... (Suv 117,4 – 118,4) ‘Whatever and as many as there are people condemned to death for having sinned towards kings and rulers, ... creatures exhausted and weakened through the suffering of hunger and thirst ...’; kim kayu är ... bitig bititsär, ... kenki aţunlarda tuga tâglök bolur (U III 75,10) ‘Whoever, whichever man ... gets letters written ..., he will be born blind in subsequent lives’.

In the following example (also with two indefinite pronouns but here not used adnominally, and an imperative in the main clause) the resumptive element is again not just a pronoun but the near-pronominal phrase ol kiši: kim kayu kîsâsär Ketumati kânttâkî ... kûtług tînlîglar ara ätizü olorup așâgâlî, birlâ olorup mânîlâgâlî, ol kiši âdıgü kîfînê kîlzûn (Mait) ‘Whoever wishes to enjoy sitting among the blessed creatures of Ketumati and to make music, to sit together and be happy, that person should perform good deeds’. In a sentence in Manichaean M III nr. 8 VII r2-4 the generalising kanyu (thus!) kiši kim is again taken up by resumptive ol kiši; note that ol kiši is, through left dislocation, kept in the nominative instead of the genitive case which it would be in by its task in the main clause: kanyu kiši kim bo yarokun ârmâk[îg] k(ü)ntü köșülên içrâ târîmîs ārsär, ol kiši b(â)lgüsi antag ârûr: ‘Any (kanyu) person who (kim) has planted inside his own heart this existence with light, that person’s mark is as follows’. Uygur and English structures are here identical.

When the resumptive pronoun is replaced or accompanied by some word signifying ‘all’, the reference is no longer a variable as it covers the group as a whole. In such instances the pronoun of the subordinate clause is not placed in the beginning: tolp sansar iǰîi JTâki tînl(i)glarûg năcă ämgâtgûlük tolgağûlûk erintürgûlûk busanturgûluk iškâr kûdîgîlär ārsär, barça ĕpkâ biğî fîl(i)în tûrûlmûktîn töroyur bûlgûrûr (TT II,2 41-46) ‘However many matters there may be for which to cause pain and affliction to all the creatures in samsâra, all (of them) come into existence and appear as a consequence of perversion by

669 Note that this part of the subordinate clause appears before the correlative pronoun, as in the example from U III just quoted; năcă has, I think, been brought forward to stress the verbs ämgât- tolga- etc..
anger’. Note that the previous sentence had barča instead of a resumptive pronoun; in the following sentence, the two appear together: anî körüp kamag kasî kadaşi başlap kim ol törödâ yiğîmiš nācâ kişîlär ärtä ärsâr olar barča körüp hâlînîhîr ïrâk tâzîlîr kaçîlîr (Suv 5.8) ‘Seeing that, whatever persons there were, foremost among them all his family, who had assembled at that ceremony, they all got very frightened and fled far away’. kim ‘who’ here serves as relative pronoun in addition to nācâ; I consider such kim to be the bridge for the emergence of kim as relative conjunction, documented in section 4.612. There we quoted the sentence tún sayu ... montag sakinê kîlîr alku tînîlgîlar bo dyan sakinêliq kişîk kim körsâr burxanîg körmiš tåg sâvâr taplayur ayayur ağîrlayurlar ‘If he meditates in this way every night, all creatures who see this meditating person will love, appreciate and honour (him) as if they had seen Buddha’ (TT V A 113). If this is understood to be generalising, the translation is ‘all creatures, whoever sees this meditating person, …’; the resumptive pronoun (translated as ‘him’) is implicit.

In the following example, where kavyût sîyär ‘which direction’ and antîn sîyär ‘that direction’ are in correlation, we find the secondary use to which the construction is put (referred to in the beginning of this section): ol tângî râsî ... tavranu kavyût sîyär tângîkîr elîgi xormuza tângî ärsâr, antîn sîyär yakîn barîp ... adaklarînta têpösi üzä yûkûnîp ... inêcä tep sözldî (U II 29, 19-21) ‘that divine boy hurriedly went into the direction in which the king Indra, the king of kings was, bowed to his feet and said the following:’. By content, the noun ‘direction’ is qualified by the clause ‘in which Buddha, the king of kings was’; Buddha was in a specific place and there is no variable as in other examples quoted in this section.

With nācâ and nâtäg the subordinate clause is adverbial and no longer has any affinity with relativisation: nācâ bo ... tângîlîr tângî katunlari ... ûd ârtürûrlîr ärsâr, nācä nācä kşan ûdlîr ârstsar, ança ança ... tângî rûnîlîr ärtâr barîr (Mait 103v4-10 = MaitH X 1r14) ‘In the measure that these ... gods and goddesses spend time ..., and ... the moments pass, in that same measure do their ... divine pleasures gradually get lost’; kajî xan ögı katun ... oğlına nācâ aytsar nây kîginîc bermädök ‘However much his father the king and his mother the queen asked their son, he gave no answer at all’ (ChristManMsFr Man v11); this last has concessive content. nâtäg is about manner and not about quantity: nâtäg taplasar inêcä kîlsun (U III 46,1-2) ‘Let him do as he likes’; nâtäg siz yarîkasar siz, antag ok kilu tâgînîyîn (MaitH XXV
3r7) ‘I will venture to act in whatever way you order (me) to’. The content and form of a sentence in U III 47,11 is very similar to the last one. nätäg clauses can also be comparative (cf. the end of section 4.632). In section 4.634 we deal with the correlative pairs näčäkä tägi ... ančaka tägi and kayu üdün ... ol üdün; these form temporal sentences which are also rather unlike relativization.

The first clause in the following sentence appears to be a correlative construction with no -sAr form: yertinčüüdäki näčä ulug yäği künlär bar, näy bo yäği küm birlæ az ülüşčåkiyä I (ms. T III MQ 62 = U 5088 quoted in the note to BT V 438) ‘Whatever there are of great New Days in this world, by no means do they [have] even the slightest part [in common] with this New Day’. The clauses kim yerči suvči kämiči bar ürsä (KP 23,4), kim bar ürsär tetiglar keŋ bilişiglär (HTs VIII 155) and kimdä birok kertgänč bar ürsär (TT V B 112-113) quoted above show the sequence bar ürsär; nevertheless the BT V instance with bar alone need not be an error: In the previous section I quoted a concessive sentence with näčä also lacking the -sAr form.

4.7. Direct speech

The most wide-spread procedure for quoting speech or thought is to have the unchanged content followed by the verb te- ‘to say’, by the quotative element te-p (corresponding by both origin and function to Turkish diye) or by both: kim “talöyka barayïn” tesär kiriglär (KP 22,2) ‘If anybody says ‘I’d like to go to sea’, (then) go (pl.)’; öz bilišiz tärs külïçin bilmez ukmaz kim mäniy ašnuки ažunta kılımï öz külïçin mäni inçä âmgätür tep (TT VI 15) ‘They do not know and understand their own ignorant and wrong actions so as to say ‘My own action which I committed in a previous existence makes me suffer this much’; “sän näčäk oztaj” tep tesär “bir kämi siyoðïn tuta üntïn” tep tedi (KP 54,4) ‘When he said ‘How did you save yourself?’ he (i.e. the other one) said ‘I got out by holding on to a piece of the ship(wreck)’; qaltï in yarokî karalî kalî katılmïš ... tepän biltimiz (Xw 137) ‘We know how light and darkness were mixed’ is also an interrogative element; the passage Xw 134-138, finally, has three instances of the phrase tepän biltimiz subordinating a number of instances of the interrogatives nä ‘how’, nädä ötö ‘for what reason’ and kim ‘who’.

The use of inscriptional te- did not differ from Uygur usage. Where Uygur has te-p, runiform inscriptions have te-yin, formed with a different converb suffix; both are used together with verbs of hearing,
saying or thinking such as äšid-, bil-, sakín- or te- itself. In the following instance from Tuñ I W2-3 the quotation is preceded by anča ‘thus’ referring to it and by the verb of saying: täŋri anča temiş ärińč: xan bertim ... ‘The heavens presumably spoke as follows: ‘I gave you a king ...’.’ anča refers to direct speech both anaphorically and cataphorically in Tuñ I S5: anta ötri kaganıma öütüňüm; anča öütüňüm:

...” anča öütüňüm. ‘Thereupon I addressed my king; this is how I addressed (him): “...” This is how I addressed (him).’ In anta aňīq kiši anča boşgurur ärmiş (KT S7 = BQ N5) ‘There, evil people used to advise (them) as follows: ‘...’ ‘Speaking thus they used to advise (them).’ savı antag ‘His speech (was) to this effect’ is a cataphoric phrase used several times in the Tuñ inscription. In the following instance of direct speech the topic biz is a postclitic to the predicate: käntü özümüňi küntä aydı öşi biz tedimiz ärsär (Xw) ‘If we said about ourselves “We are not related to sun and moon” ...’. käntü özümüňi is part of the matrix clause, put into the accusative case as done with subjects of verbal sentences dealt with as indirect speech (section 4.622).

The following Manichæan passage shows several interwoven quotation strategies: “š(i)mmu nüčükliäti oňurdä” tep sezık aştaş anča keginč bergil: “š(i)mmu öz tilin tāşşürüp kamag yaklärkä inča tep tanuklayu sav berdi: ‘sizlärädä almış agu xormuzta täŋrilä algay män ... tedi. ...” (M I 19,10-20,2) ‘If somebody puts to you the question: ‘How did he (i.e. Ohrmizd) kill the Devil?’ give the following answer: ‘Changing his own words, the devil made the following confession to all the demons: ‘I will shoot the poison which I got from you at the god Hormuzta ...’ he said. ...’ In the first case tep is followed not by te- but by the verb phrase sezık ayt- also denoting speech: It signifies ‘to ask a question’. In the second case (which includes the third and is of a type we have not mentioned hitherto) the quotation is preceded by the cataphoric demonstrative inča and another verb phrase denoting speech while, in the third, it is preceded by inča tep and a third verb phrase denoting speech (tanuklayu sav ber- ‘to confess’) and followed by tedi. Here is another involved instance: it has three tiers of quotation one within the other: samtso ačarı sözlädi: “vibakida sözläyür: ‘kün täŋri nāgü üçün čambudvip uluşag tāşşini yorir’ tep tesär keginč berür: “karańku kararığig tārkargu üçün tāşşini yorir” tep. mänî ‘barayını‘ tep sakınmakım yım mendi bo yörgükä eyin bolgu üçün sakınur män” tep tedi (HTsBiogr 181-189) Xuanzang said: “In the Vimalakirti nirdeśasūtra it says: ‘If one says ‘For what purposes does the sun circumvent the world?’ the answer is ‘It circumvents it to dispell the dark blackness’.‘
My upholding of my intention to go is also so as to accord with this view.º The following is an instance of a yes/no question incorporated both by a cataphoric demonstrative and tep: anî bîlmädi, oğ[râki] ävirgûçîlîr užîkin yörûgin tûkûl kîltîlîr mu ârki tep (HTs VII 870-2) ‘He did not know whether previous translators had rendered text and meaning in their completeness’.

Direct speech can also be used as a nominal attribute within a noun phrase, provided the head is a deverbal noun denoting thought or speech, as in taşra yorîyur teyn kû eşidîp (KT E12) ‘Hearing the rumour that he had marched out’; the converb may here have been used adnominally. In Buddhist TT VB 3 there is a sentence in which a complex expression subordinated by tep is adnominal to yörüg ‘interpretation’. ätözlîrînî asîglîg liğîr tep bîtîg bîtîyûr (TT VI 257) signifies ‘They write that for them useful book called “calendar” shows tep in a naming function.

teyn / tep can be absent: ‘kim kayu ... ilglîg âmgûkîlîg tînlî(rî)glîr bar ârsûr olarnî ymû enê kilayûn’ sakînîn onon onon sayu kâzû yorîyûr ârkûn (Suv 603,5-8) ‘roaming around at all places with the intention of putting at their ease whatever diseased and suffering creatures there are’.670 In BT VII B41-48 there is a passage in which sakînîm â ‘imagining’ is immediately preceded by a sentence with tînlîglîr ‘creatures’ as subject and predicates ending in kötûrû turur ‘keep holding up’, içgûrû turur ‘keep introducing’ and büttûrû turur ‘keep carrying out’, as content of thought.

Rarely, we find the content of speech subordinated by the particle kim: ötûndîlîr kim kâltîrmîs ârdîlîr üc tîrlûg kûzûnc ‘They said they had brought three types of present’ (U I 6,14, Magier, a Christian text); äšidî yarlîkazun eçîm-a, kim mâniy bo âtözûmîn esîrûgüm îdi kâlmaz (Suv 608,23) ‘Hear please, dear brother, that I do not wish to spare this body of mine’.671 In both examples, the object clauses which were the objects of the verbs ötûn- ‘to say respectfully’ and äšidî yarlîka- ‘to deign to listen’ followed the main clause. Old Türkic does not appear to subordinate any other type of object clauses with kim.

To sum up the means for direct quotation in Uygur: te- and tep are always preceded by either the quotation itself or by a demonstrative referring to it; te- can be preceded by tep. Other verb phrases denoting

---

670 sakînî+în is in the instrumental case; that there should be the possessive before the case suffix does not seem too likely.

671 The Qarakhanid sentence elic aydî kîm sen nûqû ol âtiy (QB 583) ‘The king said ‘Who are you, what is your name?’’ was, by the editor, wrongly taken to be another case of subordination by kim.
oral communication have *tep* to follow it or a demonstrative pronoun or, rarely, the particle *kim* to precede it in order to govern direct speech. Another rare possibility is to have an abstract denoting ‘thought’ follow its content without any sign of subordination. The most common way to quote direct speech is by merely having it followed by the sequence *tep te-* . Indirect speech, i.e. quoted speech or thought incorporated into its context, is dealt with in section 4.622 on object clauses.

In Turkic languages, the strategy of direct speech is not used only for quoting; there is no actual quoting e.g. in *yarokli karali kalti katilmis ... tepan biltimiz* (Xw 135-6) ‘we know how light and darkness were mixed’ or, probably *kim ‘ta loyka barayin” tesar kirilgar* (KP 22,2), which can also be translated as ‘Anybody who would like to go to sea is invited to do so’. Instances like *yel kilayin tesar* ‘If one wishes to bring forth wind, ...’ in 1.64 of Zieme’s Wetterzauber text are common in all sorts of Uygur manuals. We also already quoted a sentence in which something formulated as direct speech renders the subject’s intention: *‘kim kayu ... iginal agriglig amgaklig tilm(ig)lar bar arsar olarni yma enq kilayin” sakinein* (Suv 603,5-8) ‘with the intention of putting at their ease whatever diseased and suffering creatures there are’. In section 4.636 we dealt with sentences which, as objects of *teyin* and *tep*, have the content of final clauses; in section 4.635 we quoted an Orkhon Turkic causal clause introduced by *teyin*. Uygur *tep* and inscriptional *teyin* had such extended adjunct uses as ‘in order to’, ‘for the purpose of’ or even ‘because’; Orkhon Turkic instances are listed in Tekin 1968: 380-382. Especially worth noting is the sentence *beriyya cuqay yiis r’w’g’r’w’g(‘w’n)’ yazayin tesar türk bodun əlsück( KT S7 and BQ N5) ‘If you intend to settle the Shi-hui mountain forest and the T. plain, oh Turk people, you might die’, where I have translated *te-* with ‘to intend’. It is not that the converbs *tep* and *teyin* became conjunctions for various tasks but rather that the quotation strategy was put to such wide use.

4.8. *Coordination and text syntax*

The *text syntax* of the Orkhon inscriptions is discussed in *Subasi Uzun* 1995, to which the reader is herewith referred. We cannot deal with the matter in any detailed or systematic manner here (especially because our corpus is much vaster), but have selected a few topics.

Coordination is not necessarily explicit at any syntactic level: From adjectives to paragraphs, everything can by linked by merely being listed, the wider semantic and syntactic context serving as
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concatenator: täŋrilär täŋri katunläri ‘gods and goddesses’; ogulta kizta amrak ‘dearer than son and daughter’; åki ogluma yavgu šad at bertim ‘I gave my two sons the titles ‘yavgu’ and ‘šad’ (respectively); kulum künjim bódun ‘the nation (consisting of) my male and female slaves’ (ŠU S9). Implicit coordination can well be contrastive: oglum savi ädgü yavlañ bälqürgiñčä (KP 63,3) is ‘till news (from) my son turn out to be good (or) bad’; bilip bilmäst (Xw 150) ‘knowingly (or) unknowingly’ is a disjunction. In ñaštä tıgrak bürgäli yamšak iki ämiğläri (TT X 445) ‘her two breasts, firm (but) soft to touch’ the adjectives kätig and tıgrak are in obvious semantic opposition to yamšak. Sequences are sometimes conventional, as tünün künnün ‘by night and day’, or binomes such as yer senv ‘the material world’ or kam kadašım ‘my family’ (with inflectional elements repeated). Biverbs such as sëvä amrayu ‘loving’ are just as common. Finite verbs follow each other in Xw 3-4, sharing subject and circumstantials: Xormuzta tængri beš tængri birlä ... yäkkä süngüsäli kälti enti ‘The god Zerwan descended (enti) and came (kälti) together with the Fivefold God to fight the Devil’. Whole clauses sharing only the subject can also be coordinated asyndetically, as shown in the following example: nom nomlayu ... ä töz ürlüksüzünik eti äşän tükäl kärürzün (KP 23,4-7) ‘Whatever guides, pilots and seamen there are, let them come, then, and bring the prince back safe and sound’. Apposition is also a kind of coordination, e.g. among four noun phrases in okïyur män sirigini kut täprisën, käsämiš käsäsimin kanturdaçëg [karmaš isimin büttüräräçig (U I 33) ‘I call upon Šr, the goddess of happiness, who fulfills what I hoped for and brings to completion what I do’. The attested accusatives as well as the fact that the -daç forms are postposed and not preposed shows that these latter are headless relative clauses apposed in coordination. Pronouns and proper names can appear in apposition: bo nišan män Miŋ Tämürniŋ ol ‘This mark is mine – Miŋ Tämür’s’ (USp 1,10); yfarlîjkançiçi köyul örtip män irinë tinliçgka kšantë berë yarlîkazun (DKPAMPb 1271) ‘May he have pity and forgive me poor creature’. Note that group inflection applies also here, so that the case suffixes are, in these two examples, appended only to the appositions.

Often, however, coordination is explicit. Between noun phrases we have inflectional coordination with +II (cf. section 3.123), coordination
by repeated particles as in *kün ymä tün ymä* ‘both by day and by night’ or *büälgäri ymä bodani ymä* ‘both their aristocracy and their common people’, or by repeated conjunctions, such as *ap ... ap* ‘both ... and’ or *azu ... azu* ‘either ... or’ (section 3.33); by postposing *ulați*, as in *koy lâţğän ulați tünlîglarîg* ‘living creatures (such as) sheep, pigs etc.’ (section 4.21). In relatively late texts collective numerals are added after enumeration: *udçë buka äsän ikägü* appears, e.g., in *SammlUigKontr* Sa11,6, 8 and 12 signifying ‘Udçë and Buka Asän’; the text documents their collective purchase of land. Sa26 documents the sale by a father and by his two sons of their son and younger brother into slavery; the sellers are mentioned (6-7) as *atasî kutlug tämüür, aksaš ür tugmîš aksaš toktaši ičägü* ‘his father Kutlug Tämüür, his elder brother År Tugmîš and his elder brother Toktaši’.

In Uygur and Qarakhanid, *takî* can mean ‘and’ or ‘moreover’; as such it mostly joins larger units such as sentences. Conjunctions such as *takî* and *yana* precede the first sentence constituent. When sentences are coordinated with *ymä*, that particle is often placed after the first constituent (e.g. *ol ymâ nirvan mäğiši* ‘that nirvana bliss, in turn, ...’), although it can also precede the whole sentences. In the following instance, the stretch starting with *takî ymä* sums up, as it were, all that precedes (various farmers, hunters etc., then): *amari tünlîglar čaxri äŋîr r ün açşir kentir äņirär, böz batatu kas tokîyur, takî ymâ adrok užlar kantü kantü uz išin išlîyür* (KP 2,5) ‘Many people make thread of wool or hemp, weave cloth of linen or wool and, (in general,) various professionals carry out each his special profession’.

Another way to coordinate parallel syntactic structures is to have them share elements: *uyuka ärklî topolgalî ucción ärmîš, yincêgâ ärklîg üçgali ucción* ‘that which is thin is easy to pierce, they say, that which is slim easy to break’ (Tuñ). Shared elements are often bound morphemes, e.g. the possessive suffix in this sentence: *tamuda ... tugmîš takî ymâ ... beş yol içînti ... tugmîšin öyür sakînur* ‘So he remembers that he was born in hell, ... that he was, moreover, born in the five walks’ (MaiţH XV 1v23-25). In the following instance the finite verbs share the plural marker: *yer suylar suv üzüki kemi osuglug altî törlûg tâpréyür kamşayurlar* (MaiţH XX 1r2) ‘The worlds shake and rock in six ways, like a ship on water’. Sequences of clauses with the -(X)p converb can sometimes be considered to be coordinated from the func-

---

672 Among the three objects of *äŋîr*, the first is a loan from Indo-Iranian related to Skt. *cakra* and denoting a ‘spinning wheel’ while the others denote types of thread.
tional point of view, when -(X)p has no content of itself beside its join-
ing function, but in fact merely represents the choice to subordinate.

On the other hand, mere juxtaposition can also mean semantic
subordination, as in the following instance from a quite early text:
yarlïkâ€œ juâ€œ kögül turgurup kördüm, irînê [yor]f(ö)g umugusz înagsîz
bo tînîglar montag âmgüîklîg [.../]dA tüsi mâş tururlar (U II 4,8)
‘Evoking a compassionate state of mind I realised (that) these poor and
hopeless creatures had fallen into such an (existence) of suffering’.
What follows kör-dûm ‘I saw’ with no sign of subordination is in fact
clearly the implicit object of this verb. The preposed sentence antag
ugrî boltî in the following passage serves as an asyndetic temporal
clause: antag ugrî boltî yana ymâ isig özlîrîntâ öñi üdürdüm ... antag
ugrî boltî ol ok tînîglarnîn isig kanlarîn âçîm (Mait 33r18-23) ‘There
were also times (when) I killed them / ... drank their warm blood’ = ‘At
times I ...’. The same content is expressed with an -(X)p clause in
antag ugrî bolup bo üçädûda bîrisin bîrisin îçgülük îdalaguluk käzigi kâlsîr
... (TT VB 107) ‘If it happens that one has to give up these three one by
one, ...’. Note that the subordinate clause is the second one in the U II
example, but the first one in the Mait example.

Cohesion is a universal phenomenon, presupposed by users of any
language; it is cohesion that makes the reader see that the pairs of
sentences in the U II and Mait passages just quoted have subordinative
content. In Old Turkic, this presupposition makes possible (and even
demands) recourse to zero anaphora, clause patterns not demanding the
explicit filling of argument slots either within a sentence or among
sentences: In šîmnug utup isig özîn îdîp ... üc ay köni adişiît üzü tuta
yarîkadokta ‘when he graciously defeated Màra, did away with his life
and ... held him under control throughout three months’, e.g., ‘he’, ‘his’
and ‘him’ have no explicit counterpart in the Uygur clause. A plural
form as in tâgri yerîntîn tayarlar ‘they slip down from the divine land’
at least makes the subject identifiable by number although used without
explicit anaphoric, but that +lAr is not obligatory either. Demonstrative
pronouns are generally not used when reference follows from the
context. In TT X 520-521 we do find an example of a demonstrative
referring explicitly to the subject of the previous sentence in the
anaphoric use of the genitive form anîy which also qualifies the head:
tâgri burxannîyê673 çankramît kîlî yorîmîsîn kördi. anta ok anîy öçrâ

673 The suffix is spelled as NYQ.
He saw that the divine Buddha was walking back and forth in meditation. Immediately, through his experience in a previous existence of ... having heard and having listened to the teaching of the divine Buddha, the following doctrinal verse came to his mind: ‘Anaphoric demonstratives are not barred, then. kāntū can also get used anaphorically: yana o l o k y äkl d ... tä ... yBb RBa š ögrätigi üzä bo š lok nom köyülïntä kälï ’

Anaphoricity is achieved also by the repetition of nominals: xan bertim, xaniñin kodup ičkidij (Tuñ 2-3) ‘I gave you a king (but) you abandoned your king and submitted (to the Chinese);’ türk bodun tavağëka körür ârti ... türk bodun xanîn bolmayın tavağëka adrilï (Tuñ 1-2) ‘The Turk nation was dependent on China; being without a king, the Turk nation separated from China’.

Cohesion can be additionally stressed by anaphoric and cataphoric elements, by taking up lexemes from the co-text and by other means: anćep (a pro-verb), ancta otrö (e.g. in Mait 26A r4) or ancta ken ‘thereupon’, starting sentences, link them to the previous ones. ħncä is a cataphoric, anča an anaphoric pro-adverb or pro-adjective: ħncä sakıncı̄ sakınur, for instance, signifies ‘He thinks the following thoughts:’. Also for the purpose of cohesion, a segment like anı eşidip ‘hearing that’ can be placed before mention of the subject of eşid- (i.e. cataphorically). The following is a rhetorically motivated lexical topic chain, coherence being strengthened through the particle ymä: ürüg amılı n i r v a n ta oğı mänjüllug m ā η i bultukmaz, ol ymä nirvan mänısi n o m ta oğı bulgalı bolmaz. nomuğ ymä burxan a n l a r da oğı ... nomkaðci̇ bultukmaz. mänı̄n ymä burxan kutı̄ja ... kut kolmišım bar ‘There exists no eternal bliss other than peaceful n i r v a n a. That nirvāṇa bliss, in turn, cannot be attained other than by religion. Now there are no preachers of religion other than the Buddhas. And I have been praying for buddhahood’. burxan kuṭi is not in initial position in the last sentence because ‘I’ is the general topic (note that the genitive mänı̄n gets separated from its head) and because the chain is thereby closed.

The Orkhon inscriptions have a special method of cohesion, whereby preceding sentences are summed up in -(X)p clauses: elig ančä tuṭmiś ārinč elig tutup ... ‘This is how they appear to have governed the country. Governing the country, they ...’; anča tep tavağë xağanka yagı bolmiś, yagı bolup ... ‘With such words they opposed the Chinese emperor. Even though opposing him, ...’ Another form of summary
turns up in käyik yeyü tavïšgan yeyü olorur ârtimiz ... anča olorur ârkli ... (Tuñ I S1) ‘We used to live eating venison and hares’... While living in this way ...’. Mait XV 13r12 has the vowel converb instead: ötrö otşurak katag köglin ârgünintin kuñi enti. enä ìncä tep sav sözîlayür ‘Then, in a clear and resolute mood, he descended from the throne. Descending he speaks the following words:’

In the sentence ikiññi ažunta ok mu tägünür azu bo ažunta ymä mú tägünûmûkî bar? ‘Is it in the second birth that one attains it, or does attainment take place in this same birth?’ the double mU after the elements asked about and the particle ymä link the two sentences. ok after ažunta and the de-finitisation of the second verb also serve in conjunction (though by varying the means!) to make sure that the verb is not thought to be the predicate in either sentence.

A characteristic trait are demonstratives pointing at previous segments of the sentences themselves. Most conspicuous is anta ‘there’ taking up locative expressions of the same sentence especially in the runiform inscriptions of the Uygur steppe empire.

In Uygur the contents of a stretch of direct speech incorporated in the sentence are often again pointed at, e.g. in ‘...’ tep munïlayu tutuzdü ‘He admonished him saying ‘...’, with munïlayu ‘thus’. Cf. ančä boşgurur ârmîş: ‘...’ tep ančä boşgurur ârmîş in KT S7 = BQ K5.

In what follows, the final meaning of -gAlI is taken up by anï ü: män sini nizvanï kadgu ... tarkarïp ârænt kutïn bulturqalï anï üçün sûrüp üntürdüm ‘I had you banished to make you get rid of the sorrows of passion and to find arhatthood’. The content of converbs and conversbal phrases is often taken up by anîn, the instrumental form of the pronoun; we find e.g. basat berü ñ(a)rijkamaklarï üçä, anîn ... (HTs X 256) ‘by their giving support, thereby’, bilgâli ukgalï yarayur üçün, anîn ... (TT VI 383 var.) ‘because it helps to know and to understand, therefore’, köyü kâzûtü tägünükümüç üçün, anîn ... (Suv 401,9) ‘because we have undertaken to guard (this earth), therefore’, alp kuçarguluk üçün, anîn tâñrî tâgrisi burxan ... tînlîññi kögün yavalturup ... ‘because (they are) difficult to save, that is why Buddha, the god of gods ... softens a creature’s heart ...’ (DKPAMPb 115). Another passage with such anaphorics is kišig ... yinîk körtačï. nomug učizladačïlar üçün, anîn burxanlar anta tûgmaç; köjüllari tar, kirlari târıñ üçün kut bulmîş tüzünîlîr bo tîltagî anta barmaç (HTs V 100-106) ‘Because they humiliate people and disparage teaching, that is why Buddhas are not born there; because their minds are narrow and their filth deep, that is why āryen who have found blessing do not go there’; it clearly shows that the construction is meant to add
prominence to the causal phrases preposed. The matter is dealt with in Schulz 1978: 115-117. -(X)p anîn is found a number of times in the DLT, quoted in Johanson 1988: 146. In IrqB 35 we can read (and understand!) the text either as urupanîn or as urup anîn. The sequence may have led to the form -(X)pAnIn, as explained in section 3.286.

One domain where sentence-internal reference is extremely common is within conditional constructions and even more in the correlative sentences also using the -(s)Ar form: Reference can there be taken up by demonstratives, by reflexives, by personal pronouns, by nominals with anaphoric possessive suffix like ụkũš+in ‘most of it (acc.)’ or by phrases such as olar barča ‘all of those’, ol taši ‘that stone (acc.)’ or anin sîgar ‘in that direction’; see sections 4.64 and 4.65 for details. What is interesting is that there can be anaphoric reference in the main clause even to generalised arguments, as are expressed by ‘one’ in English but left unexpressed in Old Turkic; cf. the following two instances: yîdlamîš yîdîg alka înçe ôtkûrû usar; ol ṭînlîg ât’ôzi yîpar yûgmûk burxan ât’ôzi bolur (TT VI 172-3) ‘If one can perceive all smelled scents in this way, then that creature’s (i.e. the perceiving creature’s) body will become the body of the Buddha (named) ‘Concentration of Perfume’’; turkaru ɔnî kertü yorîgîn yorîsar ol temîn kuşika sanur (TT VI 33-4) ‘If one (Ø) continuously lives a honest and correct life, one (ol) will straightway be considered a human being’.

Cohesion can depend on a combination of subtle factors. Take the stretch küčümûş bir ikimişti bîrlâ ᵇînalîm, biz ikiyûdû kanyûsî küčlügrûk biz (Wettkamp 41-44): This signifies ‘Let us test our strength with each other, (to see) who of us two is the stronger’, but the words ‘to see’ are just implicit. How do we know that the two sentences belong together? They share the lexeme küć ‘strength’ in both sentences assigned to the 1st person plural, and the information that this 1st person plural consists of two individuals. The first sentence is a sort of paraphrase of the second, since the question ‘Who of us two is the stronger?’ can best be answered after the test proposed in the first question.

Cohesion may also be absent: Consider the sentence kayu üdûn mûn beş törlûg ulûg tûlûg kördûm ârti, antada bûrû ... olorgalî kûsâyûr ârtim (MaitH XI 4v18) ‘When I had seen the 5 sorts of great dreams, from that time on I had the wish to sit ...’. The pronominal phrases kayu üdûn and antada bûrû are not in correlation: The subordinate clause is construed so as supply a static time frame, but the main clause takes up the time referred to in that subordinate clause as the starting point of a state of affairs existing since that previous time and the time of the main event.
Sentence interpolations are not rare; e.g.: *yinčä yöröńgin kim bar ārsär tğiilgär keŋ biligülgär boşgunsarlär ünüşarlär üküšin bilü umaçlar* (HTs VIII 153) ‘Even if clever and broad-minded persons – whoever there is – study and listen to its subtle definitions, they cannot understand most of it’; or perhaps one should translate: ‘If any clever and broad-minded persons study …’ or ‘Even if persons who study it are clever and broad-minded – whoever there is – they won’t be able to …’. The structure of the Old Turkic sentence, at any rate, is such that *kim bar ārsär* is interpolated. There are, in fact, several interpolations already in the Orkhon inscriptions. The most normal interpolation, so to speak, is the vocative address: *täüŋri basmasar, yer tälınmäsär, türk bodun, eliŋin törögüün käm artañ u đaččä ārti?* (KT IE22) ‘As long as the sky did not press down (upon you and) the earth did not open (beneath you), oh Turk nation, who could have been able to destroy your land and your government?’ Here are another two interpolations, in direct speech, which are in fact different accounts of the same utterance: *aŋranu s̄alămüşär kačanîñöl arsun ol bizni – [xaganî alp ārmis, ayguçëisî bilgä ārmis – kačanîñ ţärşölürţöt çök* (Tuñ 20-21), yorimäsar bizni – xaganî alp ārmis, ayguçëisî bilgä ārmis – kačanîñ ţärşöl bizni oluştöt çök* (Tuñ 29-30) ‘If we do not fight them / If we do not march out, they will – their ruler is said to be valiant, their advisor wise – whatever happens, they will definitely kill us’. The first passage has the expression *našar bizni* both before and after the interpolation, while the second passage has the object *bizni* both before and after it; the first passage refers to the subject of the result clause through the pronoun *ol* already before the interpolation. These are typical means for taking care of coherence to bridge the cut caused by the interpolation.

The interpolation of ls. 42-43 in a late *baxšï ögdisi* edited by M. Ölmez (Laut & Ölmez 1998: 267) has its parallel in English: *tîlîn alku keŋürüm sözlümlürum kürşüüm ol därńi nom padaklarî bolzun* ‘May all I speak about in detail become – I hope – incantations and verses of teaching’. The enveloping sentence is here, in fact, an asyndetic object of the hope referred to in the interpolation.

---

674 See section 3.134 for this element.
Pragmatics deals with speech acts and with the use to which language is put in interpersonal relationships. Normally one would not expect to find much information on pragmatics in sources from a dead language spoken in a society about which we know so little, especially when the vast majority of these sources is translated from other languages and deals with religious matters. The fact is, however, that the corpus includes many (religiously motivated) narrative texts containing numerous instances of direct speech. These show such oral characteristics as vocatives and interjections, a freer word order, situation-bound deictics, repetition, rhetorical questions and so forth; cf. *körünlär körünlär ... kaç yanlığ körtlä kaç yanlıg säviglig ärür* ‘See, see ... in how many ways he is pretty, in how many ways lovely!’. Another characteristic of speech is the use of endearment in *+kIñA*, which can draw the noun phrases of whole passages into its tenor; it not only refers to entities ‘loved’ or ‘pitied’ by the speaker but also often signals affection for the addressee and his/her world: See section 3.111 above and OTWF section 2.1. When referring to the speaker himself, *+kIñA* expresses humility as a means of politeness. Private letters which are, in our corpus, mostly addressed to family members, are very interesting in this respect.

Some important speech acts have to do with the communication of the speaker’s volition to his addressees and with what he thinks the addressees should be doing without presenting himself as the motive of the projected action; we will deal with these two types of speech acts in sections 5.1 and 5.2 respectively. Section 5.3 deals with politeness and the way the speaker positions himself in society. Getting people to do things is not, of course, the only use to which language can be put. One use is egocentric; it has to do with crying out one’s feelings. This does not mean that one does not, when shouting out, disregard other people’s hearing one’s utterances; only that one is not, at the moment, being cooperative. One speech act which is strongly addressee-oriented but still highly non-cooperative is cursing. Other language uses do involve addressees fully, e.g. trying to catch people’s attention in the first place, trying to get information out of them or arguing with them. For still
others like promising, apologizing or naming, the language may not have evolved distinctive means.

Exclamations are discussed in section 3.4. They sometimes bear phonic marks of their function, as when the DLT writes äsiz (a noun which served as base to the verb äsirkä-) as äüssiz and defines it as ‘a word of sighing at a loss’. The DLT is, in general, a good source for interjections. Dankoff & Kelly 1985: 273 list, among other categories, interjections, vocative particles, calls to animals (different calls for making kids, dogs, foals, falcons or puppies come, for inciting asses to leap females, for making them walk on when they stumble or for making them stop, for inciting oxen to drink, for inciting or restraining horses or for making them stale, for making camels kneel, for inciting rams to butt etc.). Using insults and words of abuse (listed there on p. 274) is a different speech act than any of these. Dankoff & Kelly 1985: 273 also list onomatopoeica and animal sounds.

The interrogative pronoun nā ‘what’ introduces exclamatory sentences as in bo nā ängäklig yer ärmīš! ‘What a place of suffering this turns out to be!’ (KP 4,8), nā ymā taŋ, nā ymā tavrak ‘Oh how surprising, how fast!’ or nā tavrakät ‘How wonderful!’ (HTs III 945). nā ymā of the instance just quoted becomes nā mà in the DLT: nā mà ädgü kïši ol ‘How good that person is!’; nā mà yavuz nāp ol bo ‘How bad this thing is!’ (fol. 539 ol clearly used as copula). The sentence körünlär körünlär ... kâ yağlıg körül kâ yağlıg sıvılgıl ärür ‘See, see ... in how many ways he is pretty, in how many ways lovely!’ shows how exclamatory interrogatives may have emerged from some type of analytical object clause. The exclamatory use of interrogatives should not be confused with rhetorical questions as in muntada ymā munçadinët nągu bolgay? (Mait 26A r3.4) ‘What could be more wondrous than this?’. In neither case does the speaker expect any new information from the addressee. The rhetorical question is a question to which the speaker (thinks he) knows the answer; exclamatory interrogatives, however, consitute no question at all: Note that nā in nā ymā taŋ! is not translated as ‘what’ but as ‘how’.

Demonstrative anča ymā and its contraction ančama do the same as exclamative nā: ančama máy! ančama ädgü asığ tusu! ančama ädgü kut kïv! (MaitH XI 3v.7) ‘Such happiness! Such good favour! Such good luck and blessing!’ Further exclamatory examples with ančama ‘So ...!’ are quoted in § A,b of the UW entry for ančama. The following sentence is a rhetorical question with mU in which there is an exclamatory demonstrative: anča ymā eçgul yağlıg körümüz mü?
TT X 254) ‘Doesn’t he look so very splendid?’ Most instances quoted here with interrogatives or demonstratives have the particle ymā > mA following them.

Trying to catch somebody’s attention is a different speech act from addressing by using a vocative somebody who knows he is the addressee. The interjection for calling somebody whose name one does not know is ay, as in ay, kim sän? (U I 41,5) ‘Hey, who are you?’ If one does knows the name of the person whose attention one is trying to catch, one can, e.g., say a m(a)x(a)tvï-ya (HTs III 779) ‘O Mahāsattva’. If one is addressing somebody who knows he is the addressee, one uses only postposed (ya), as in yalâyâliglär bäglärni (U IV A 55) ‘Oh lion of humans, god of fortune of kings and lords!’, an address to a king. Beside ay, the DLT also mentions kï (the base of kïkïr-to ‘call out to somebody’) and •– as vocative particles; kï is still used in Anatolia for calling people from afar.

Cursing is a distinct speech act: Its primary use presumably was negative influence on a person’s fate by magical verbal means, but, said in a person’s face, it might always have been used also as a simple provocation. A Manichean passage shows us an embedded curse, using a distinctive suffix: bir âkintikâ karganurlar alkanurlar takï .. okïš urlar “yok yodun boluýur .. otkâ örtänkâ k%pöö tušuýur ..” tep sögüüurlär (M I 9,11-14) ‘They curse each other and shout at each other, abusing each other by saying “Get destroyed! Fall into fire and flames with your head downwards!”’. This is a curse addressed to the speaker’s adversary; 3rd person imperatives were presumably used for cursing absent persons. toploka tol (DLT fol.217) also appears to curse the addressee, although Käšgari translates it as “May the grave be filled with him”, since tol is a 2nd person and not a 3rd person imperative.675 Cf. further süprük ‘Go as sweepings without anybody caring about them’ (DLT fol.382): This appears to be the imperative of an otherwise unattested -(X)k- derivate from süpür- ‘to sweep’.676

675 tol- can have either the receptacle to be filled as subject, or the substance to fill the receptacle; this is unlike English, where ‘to fill’ is used both of the filling agent and of the filling substance. One can translated Käšgari’s sentence as ‘Get crammed into the grave’. toploka is presumably a simplification of toplok+ka, from toplok ‘cracks in the ground’ (DLT fol. 235).

676 This formation is dealt with in OTWF section 7.24; there is no justification for Dankoff & Kelly’s changing the form to ‘süprül’.
Questions are asked by using interrogative-indefinite pronouns or the interrogative particle *mU*, whose functioning is discussed in sections 3.343 and 4.3; note that Old Turkic interrogative sentences do not have patterns of their own but follow those of positive sentences. In section 4.4 we ask whether interrogative pronouns appear *in situ* or whether they tend to initial position. Section 3.134 deals with the interrogative pronouns themselves. Questions formed with *mU* expect answers equivalent to English ‘Yes’ or ‘No’, though there are no such sentence answers in Old Turkic proper; the DLT mentions *ävät* and a few variants of that for ‘yes’. Nor are there any pro-verbs such as ‘I do’ or ‘She doesn’t’. The answer (which is, of course, a different speech act) then has to be a part-echo of the question, often the predicate by itself. In DLT fol. 197 we read, e.g., that the answer to *käräk mû* ‘Is it necessary?’ is *käräk* ‘Yes it is’.

The Orkhon Turkic interrogative particle *gU* signals that the speaker expects or prepares a negative answer: *azu bo savïmda iqid bar gu* (KT S10, BQ N 8) signifies ‘Or is there a lie in what I said?’; *Türk matï bodun bäglär, bödkä körügmä bäglär gû yağïtağï siz* (KT S11) ‘Oh strong (?) Turk nation and lords, oh lords who have shown allegiance till now, will you fail?’

Interrogative sentences either solicit answers, or they are rhetorical questions (which are either left for the addressee to answer for and to himself or supplied with an answer by the speaker). The pronoun *kanï* ‘where?’ is often (though not exclusively) used in rhetorical questions; in that case it does not expect local information as an answer but elicits the realization on the part of the addressee that the entity upon which *kanï* is predicated is missing or absent: *ellig bodun ärtim; elim amtï kanï? ... xaganïlg bodun ärtim; xaganïm amï kanï?* (KT E9) ‘I was a nation with a state; where is my state now? ... I was a nation with a ruler; where is my ruler now?’. *kanï* is used in this way also in QB 1384: *kanï? kim katuldï ölümdî kaçïp?* ‘Who fled death and was saved? Where is he?’ The QB has nearly 70 instances of this element; many of those are rhetorical, others do ask for answers, as a DLT example seems to do. In HTs V 4,15 (edition of Tuguševa) the king Šilâdiyta asks king Kumara: *ya Kumari elig, Taçaë t[oyin] kanï?* ‘Oh king Kumara, where is the Chinese monk?’ and is then surprised to hear that the person he asked about has not come. This is not rhetorical either.

Here is a rhetorical question from a letter (UigBrief C7) written in what seems to be close to spoken language; the interpolation found in it
also testifies to this: s(ä)n mini, kari ətaqını tesär sän – yol yer körđäy – källıp körüšüp barsar sän n(tä)gü bolur ‘As for me, your old father – you’ve seen roads and places – how would it be if you came for a while and we saw each other?’ The two conditional forms in this stretch do not express conditions either; one is a topicaliser and the second serves the rhetorical purpose of the sentence. Now consider anış savıñ tınılagüçi kışilär barća înçe tep teyürär: “bu kutsuz tınılgıñıñ savıñ nágulàk kertgınır sızlär? nágü sözläsär barća äüzlaydır” tep. (DKPAMPb 271) ‘People who listen to his words all say the following: “Why do you believe the words of this wretched creature? Whatever he says, it’s all lies!” Here the motive for uttering the rhetorical question is supplied straightway. Interrogative pronouns also serve exclamatory function: In KP 5,1, the (sad) Good Prince says (among other things): näßük tugdum män ‘Why was I born, I?’ Here the postverbal pronoun is redundant in content and grammar but takes up reference to the topic; hence its post-predicative position. It is as if he had asked: ‘Why did I, of all people, have to see this?’ In (TT X 254) ‘Isn’t he look so very splendid?’, finally, the expected answer is ‘Yes, he does.’

To contradict a view held by the addressee, one adds ärmäz to a proposition (here with aorist), otherwise leaving it unchanged (here with an aorist): burun tıl ätöz ärkliğ alır ärmäz yraktaki adkangug (AbbiB 77b13) ‘It is not correct that the senses of the nose, the tongue or the body perceive distant sense objects’. When asking the addressee to agree to a proposition he holds, the speaker adds ärmäz mü ‘isn’t it?’ to it. anća ynâ katîg kiñig sav sözlädi ärmäz mü? (DKPAMPb 362) ‘Now that really is a strong-willed thing he said, isn’t it?’ or ‘Isn’t that a ... thing he said!’ and tâpränçısız bolutom ärmäz mü? (Suv 626,19) are rhetorical questions; ärmäz mü applies to the sentence as a whole. There are further instances of -dl ärmäz mü in HTs VII 121 and 127.

Käşğiñ (föl.168) shows some anthropolinguistic observation ability when suggesting that one should, when reading out the Coran among crude Turks and their women, muffle the reading of verses containing the words sikkin, yumsik, ixtilaq or (among the Ögüz) the interrogative particle am: “For”, he explains, “they do not understand the meaning but consider that the sounds of the words mean what they understand by them in their own language (i.e. sik ‘the male member’, tilak ‘clitoris’ and am ‘vulva’ in the Ögüz dialect respectively); so they commit a sin
5.1. The communication of speaker’s volition

In Old Turkic, the means used for expressing epistemic mood do not coincide with those used for volitional mood; we therefore separate the two topics and have dealt with epistemic mood in section 3.27; these two are, we think, semantically as well as pragmatically quite distinct matters. Volitional mood is usually conveyed with the forms of the volitional paradigm (q.v. in section 3.231) if the speaker’s wishes, orders or entreaties are to be transmitted to the addressee or to a third party. Other topics to be discussed in this section are the expressions of hope and exhortation, the asking of permission, the expression of readiness to carry out an action and the like.

The volitional content most commonly expressed is that of the speaker telling the addressee(s) to carry out (or, if the form is negative, not to carry out) some action; in the singular, this is normally expressed by the singular 2nd person imperative form consisting of the simple stem. The form is often accompanied by the synharmonous particle gIl as described in section 3.344. In many Uygur texts (though not yet in Orkhon Turkic), the ‘plural’ form in -(X)Il is used only for polite address to the singular, -(X)ylAr being used for the plural (polite or familiar): E.g., Mait XV 12v11f. has tur-ȗr, tavran-ȗr, sakin-ȗr, ûdala-ȗr ‘stand up ... hurry up ... consider ... abandon’; said in an address to a king; the same passage has odunuylar ‘wake up’ said to a multitude.

Occasionally a future form is used for expressing a firm injunction: ötrö xan xårîlgkamädî, “barmagay sîn” tep tedi (KP 19,3) ‘Then his father the king did not permit (it); he said “You will not go!”’. The content of the following utterances is linked to a hope: közin körgäy ärki biz xanîmîzin xanînî nomlug tilgîn kûnîn muntakaña ävîrîn (HTs VII 1241) ‘We might see with our eyes that the lord of our lord right here turns the wheel of dharma every day’; bulgay ärki biz yeg adrok buyanîg (Suv 609,11) ‘We will maybe (or ‘hopefullly’) attain excellent punya’. The sentences themselves need not, however, actually have expressed that hope; they could be statements about the future, meant to serve as encouragement. This is what Gabain might have been thinking of when she said that -gAy can be used as optative. However, some of the instances of -gAy + ärki listed in UW 436b (§ III

677 In Judaism (where the coming of the Messiah is traditionally always expected in the nearest future) the use of such expressions is (also) quite normal.
p of the entry ārki) express apprehension: īnča bolmazun ol ārdin bīzīnā ādā tūdā kālgāy ārki (U III 56,3) ‘I hope no harm comes to us from that man’; bušānīp īšīmiz [...] būtgāy ārki tep ēzsintī (HTsTug 67,12) ‘He was worried, saying [how could] our matter succeed’. It might therefore be more correct to say that -gAy ārki expresses emotional involvement beside its epistemological content.

-gAy ārdi expresses volitive content in a rather indirect tone: aṃtī, tāṃprīm, bo montag tārs tātrū bīlidīgī ūnīlīglarka kōnī yol orok kōrtgūrū bērgāy ārdī, kim kōnī yolča ... yōrtzūnlar ārdī (TT VI 237) ‘I wish you would now, my lord, graciously show such perversely thinking creatures the right way, so that they would walk along the right road’. This is addressed by a bodhisattva to Buddha and the tone is accordingly polite, as shown, among other things, by the use of the 3rd person for the 2nd and by the addition of ārtī. Similarly in an address to the Chinese emperor: mūnlūg kadaglīg ōtüğūmīn āṣidū yarlıkap bügü kōgūl ẓūzā tītrāmākūmin bīlī yarlıkagay ārdī (HTs VII 770) ‘May you deign to listen to my deficient and failing appeal and, by metaphysical spirituality, deign to know my trembling’.

Using the 1st person singular volitional form, the speaker proposes to the addressee to participate in an action he would himself like to carry out (or not to carry out if the verb is negative): The translation of barayīn (KP 19,1) as ‘Let me go!’ after all consists of an invitation to the addressee to permit the speaker to carry out the action of going. In nātāg sīz yarlıkasar sīz, antag ọk kīlu tāgināyīn (MaitH XXV 3r7) ‘I will venture to act in whatever way you order (me) to’ the speaker’s volition can better be characterised as a readiness to act. When the speaker happens to be Buddha, as in the following example, the purport of the volitive form becomes practically identical with that of the future tense; in the following sentence this form thus appears together with muna, which here asks for the addressee’s attention to an event which is about to take place: muna aṃtī mān ... magat eldākī ūnīlīglarmīn isīg ọz kūrknīkārīn kāisīz tūrkārīn (TT X 125-130 as completed by Zieme in his ‘Nachlese’ to the text), perhaps to be translated as ‘See how I intend to ... do away completely with the fear which the creatures of the land of Magadha feel concerning their life’. Another instance of muna with an -(Ah)In form appears in TT X 199-201.

As a sign of politeness, the 3rd person imperative form can be used for addressing the 2nd person: bo kutsuz kovī ūnīlīglar ụčūn tārs bilīgīn ayīg kīlīnčīn kētmnāk alīn ēvīsīn yarlıkazun, tāṃprīm, kim ụkzūn bīlzūnklīr (TT VI 20-21) ‘May he, my lord, for the sake of these unhappy and
The following passage shows two different uses of the 3rd person imperative with no person reference; they are linked by implicit causality: näŋ käyikäg olür[tip] ätin yemäzwä, bizä osuglug ängäkkä ymä tägmäzwä (MaitH XX 13r-9-13) ‘One should by no means kill wild animals and eat their meat (so that) one does not get to suffer as we do’. Only the first sentence is prescriptive on the part of the speaker; the second one should more strictly correspond to the wishes of the addressee than of the speaker, who is already in hell. The following passage is similar, but here the first sentence expresses impersonal mood (section 5.2): ünrkaru äš iğgü ińä kołosänä așanmak käräğä, nizvanlar käçlag bolmazun, äti özkä ada kilmażun (M III nr.6, 12,3-5) ‘It is necessary to have one’s meals thus, at the right times, lest the vices get strong and harm the body’.

In pronominal questions coupled with mood, it is the addressee’s wish that is solicited; e.g. kayu balikta tugayin? ‘In which town should I be (re)born?’. amrak ögüküm könän nääk bärägün män? (KP 9,7) signifies ‘How should I break my darling’s heart?’, this is what the speaker expects the addressees’ demands to boil down to. 2nd person imperatives do not appear in questions.

Particles such as gIl and (in KäsGar’s language) eU lend special urgency to imperatives; see section 3.344 for examples. gIl is very common but is rarely used with negated forms. In HTs III 673, the future form bol-gay ‘It will become’ is used as a modal particle: “sän amü bolgay azän] içä ağıtnäm sudur [aği]lıkğ nomlagiğ” tep tedi ‘(Mähäkäşäpa) said “Would you please now get up to the pulpit and preach the sütra treasury?”’ bolgay, which here serves as translation of

678 The context is that the prince would like the king to give everything in the state treasury away as alms, and the treasurers have been expressing their worries about the imminent bankruptcy of the state. This is thus not a rhetorical question.

679 The English particle please also, after all, comes from a modal phrase like ‘if it please you’, still used without truncation in French s’il te / vous plait. German bitte presumably elliptically stands for ‘(ich) bitte (dich / Sie)’. Concerning the use of bol- cf. Turkish olur expressing consent.
a Chinese particle used in imperial commands, is no doubt truncated from yeg bolgay ‘It will be better’ (or ‘quite good’) used asyndetically: Cf. yeg bolgay ärti [...]p yep yorîlîm ärti (Mait 110v8) ‘It would have been better (if) we had lived enjoying ...!’. The use of yorîlîm ärti and not *yorîlîmiz ärsâr (as in the translation) shows that the whole sentence yeg bolgay ärti had already become downgraded to particle status.

ärti is added to the 1st and 3rd person volitional forms to express irreal wishes: yersuveda uzun yaşadî ārsâr üküş ögrînçü màjû sizni bîrlâ körzün ārti, üzültüg âdîgi kîlîncîn tükîrîzün ârti, taşt(i)n sîgär k(a)m(a)g tûzünlâr [bîrlâ] kut kîv bulu yorîzun ârti (M III nr.5 r10-15) ‘Had he lived for a long time on earth he would have seen a lot of happiness together with you, he would have completed his spiritual good actions, in the public domain he would have lived finding happiness together with all righteous people (but suddenly he died)’. In körmîyîn ārti munî tâg ulug âoğ ângäkîg (Suv 626,7) ‘I wish I had not seen such great and bitter suffering’ the wish is shown to be irreal by the context, the speaker having just witnessed much suffering. An instance with the 1st person plural volitional form and ārti is quoted in the previous paragraph from Mait 110v8. QB 1539 also has *-sUn ārti expressing an irreal wish, in parallel to -sA kârâk ârdî telling the reader what, in spite of reality, would have been the more appropriate course of events: kârâk ârdi bilgî tirîlsâ kutun / kamug âlsün ârdî bilîgîsz utun; ‘It would have been better to let the wise live on and be blessed; were it only that all the foolish and shameless would die!

Compounding the 1st and 3rd persons imperative with ārti can also give real wishes a more polite expression: In the sentence tâprîkânîniz uzun özîn kâlîn kutun tûrkaru adasazan tûdasazan ârmîkî bolzûn ārti (BT V 516-8) ‘Our majesty, I wish he were to attain a long life, that he were to live full of blessing and that he were continuously free from trouble’ the wish is certainly not meant to be irreal, especially since it stands in parallellism with berzûnlâr (515) and bolzûn (519, 522); rather, the motive for ārti is clearly politeness, the added content being something like ‘if it were possible’. The reason why the construction is not used in the other three cases in the passage must be that their topics are not identical with the addressee; there the angels are asked to help him as well as the inner status of his realm in one case, its outer realm in the other. A similar sentence in a Buddhist text is maytri burxan bizni körzün ârti (MaitH XXI 2r10) ‘If only Buddha Maitreya would see

---

680 This is the way the unreal condition is construed; see also section 4.64.
this hope is uttered by creatures living in hell, so that politeness and deference cannot be distinguished from the irreality of the wish as presumably felt by the speakers. Sinning creatures in MaitrH XXIII 9v4-6 express the hope that Buddha Maitreya may not see them committing their sin by using the verb phrases körmäzün ärdi and ukmazun ärdi while in XXI 3v14-16 they express the hope that they will see Buddha Maitreya with the clause maytri burxanag körälim ärdi and that the community will not see them by using the form körmäzünläär ärdi. Further examples can be found in UW 405, § 24 of the entry for är-; ärät remains in the singular also when the lexical verb is plural.

The analytical form -mAk+l bolzun has optative meaning; it expresses a prayer for the person referred to in the possessive suffix: There are a number of Manichaean instances in M III nr.15 r20-24, BT V 524 or BT V 490 (yadîlmakî bolzun ‘may it spread’). burxan kutilîg (thus!) küsüšläär kanmakî bolzun (DKPAMPb 486) ‘may their wishes in connection with Buddhahood get fulfilled’ is Buddhist, as are instances in HT’s VII 757 and twice Pfahl III 26-27: Two of these have the shape -mAk+lArI bolzun. With the 2nd person plural we have mäyikä tägmäkinjelër bolzun (Hochzeit 28) ‘May you attain happiness!’; with the 1st biz kamagun anta burxan kutnga alkiš bulmakimiz bolzun (MaitH Y 53) ‘May we all at that point obtain blessing for attaining buddhahood!’ Note that the nominal referring to the persons whom the prayer is to benefit stays in the nominative.

Giving an example for the versatile element kalï, DLT fol.548 brings the sentence sän kalï barsa sän and translated it as ‘If only you had come!’: By this translation, this appears to be a way in which irreal wishes are expressed in Qarakhanid. This use presumably comes from rhetorical questions of the type kačsa kalî kurtulur (DLT fol.383) ‘How can he escape from it by fleeing?’.

When the same verb is used in the conditional and then in the imperative, the speaker signals that he does not mind or care if the action is carried out; e.g. barsar bargïl (KP 30,6) ‘Go if you want to’. Rabgüzî has this same construction (see Schinkewitsch 1926: 78 § 121); we also have it in a variety of modern Turkic languages.

As auxiliary, kör- ‘to see’ expresses a conscious effort to carry out the action described in the lexical verb (section 3.252). Its imperative is used with exhortative content: yelî kör ‘See to it that you ride fast!’ (Tuñ 26); saklana körgil ‘Make sure that you take care!’ (TT X 426).
The use of yämü as defined in DLT fol.455 shows it asking the addressee for confirmation and consent concerning the action he is being asked to do: sän bargïl yämü ‘You will go, won’t you?’; according to Kâşgarî this is a particle meaning “Did you accept these words and memorize them in order to do what you were told?”.

Injunctions and entreaties can be linked with promises, which are then put into the future; the following is from a runiform inscription from the Uygur Steppe Empire: yana içik, ölmäçi yetmäçi sän (ŠU E5) ‘submit again and (if you do that) you will neither die nor perish’. Similarly in a source from the Mongol period (see details in footn. 186): tört yiŋakdïn bo nom ärđing kejirä yada beriŋlar; ogulnuŋ kizriŋ ulagi sapığı üzülmiägöy (49-53): ‘Be so nice as to spread this doctrine jewel in all four directions (and) the chain of (your) offspring will not stop’.

Old Turkic mood can be subordinated; in the following instance, e.g., we find it in a postposed relative clause with consecutive content: anïn amtï kamag bursay kuvargdïn iki toyn ötünü täginür män, kim käntämük männig ävintä aşançunlar (Mait fr. quoted in the n. to TT I 160) ‘Therefore I now politely invite two monks from all communities, who may come and have meals every day at my home’. This is akin to final clauses (section 4.636), which can also have sentences with -zÚn forms subordinated by kim.

5.2. The communication of impersonal necessity

Analytical means are available for impersonal mood, which expresses an obligation not presented as being the speaker’s wish. Among them we find the very common verb phrase in -mïš kärgâk; e.g. bilgä yalïŋk oglï bo nomug išidägli ulagi küstüš öritmiš kärgâk (MaitH XV 6r21) ‘A wise person should have developed a strong wish to listen to this doctrine’. With a pronominal subject: sän ymä amtï kökmäk iš idgïli ulug küsüš öritmiš kärgâk ‘You should now let your heart roam’ (U III 82.21-2).

Sometimes -mïš has a possessive suffix referring to such a subject: anïn männ anata ažun tut缅äm kärgâk ‘therefore I should get born there’. And sometimes the proposition is meant to apply for any (unexpressed) subject: kïrlärïn tapçakarïn yümïš arïmïš kärgâk ‘One needs to have

---

681 I follow Atalay’s reading. Dankoff & Kelly read ‘yamu’. Kâşgarî adds “Its root is the word ye which is a particle meaning ‘yes’; the mïm and the wïw are the interrogative” (i.e. mü). This must be equal to Turkish emi, which has initial stress as befits a word whose second part is mï, and exactly the same meaning as defined by Kâşgarî. e – ye is also the first part of ävät – äwät – yämät ‘yes’, with an emphatic particle discussed in section 3.341.
washed away and cleaned its dirt and filth’ (Suv 142,1). While -mIš kärgäk may be describing what states one should strive to have attained the content of -gU kärgäk may be describing what one should strive for: bo iki törlüg ädgül[ärkä tükäl]lig bolgu kärgäk (Suv 23,7) ‘One should be equipped with these two sorts of virtues’. The QB instead has kärräk with the -sA form and subject pronoun in the nominative case (examples in Hacemosinoğlu 1996: 94).

The necessity expressed by -gU ol is impersonal in two senses: Firstly the speaker does not explicitly say that he himself wants the content of the proposition to take place (as he would with an imperative); secondly there is no explicit or implicit reference to a subject: kraša älgindä tutup munä sözlägü ol (ZweisprFr r 2) ‘One must hold the monk’s dress in one’s hand and pronounce the following:’ or turuš tüütstä saklangu ol; äd yol tilämäktä âängu ol (TT I 196-7) ‘One should be careful in strife; one should take care when pursuing possessions or luck’; further examples appear in BT I D 317-320 (one of them as körmägü ol ‘one should not divine’). In late texts -gU ol can be contracted to -gUl: 682 ETŞ 20,225 has sakïngu ol, e.g., while the parallel passage in 231 writes sakïngul. The form sakïngul should be read also in Suv 25,13 as determined by Zieme in his reedition, against ‘-gIl’ in the Radloff-Malov and Kaya editions; cf. sakïngu ol in Suv 25,13. The form is common in medical texts, where it signifies ‘one should ...’, with e.g. 17 examples in Heilk II,1 alone.

-gU ärür (as in kirgü ärür ‘one must enter’ in StabUig 155,31) and -gU ärmäz (as in kakïgu ärmäz ‘one must not be angry’ in Suv 443,9) have the same meaning as -gU ol. These are, however, also used with explicit subjects, together with the same content of anonymously motivated necessity: bilgä yaluyuk oglı täprü mäşişäymä artok yapışgu ärmäz (MaitH XV 5r13) ‘Nor should a wise human being attach itself too much to divine pleasures’, e.g., has a subject in the nominative; cf. also känütä özärungä asig tusu bolgu ârsär ymä (Suv 230,4) ‘although it is meant to be useful for themselves’.

-är-di can be added to -mIš, -mAk or -sXk forms with kärgäk or to -gU with or without kärgäk for two purposes: Either the speaker speaks of a necessity in the past without renouncing his claim as far as the present is concerned. Another possibility is of the speaker to express an irreal

---

682 Zieme 1969 n.267 still thought that this was a variant of the 2nd person imperative particle gll and may actually be right concerning some very late texts: The sentence kälip körüš bargul in a letter which has several Middle Turkic characteristics (Brieifr C9) is certainly very directly addressed to one person and can be translated as ‘Come, let us see each other (and then) go (back again)’.
wish concerning an event which could have taken place at his moment of speaking but hasn’t, possibly regretting that it hasn’t done so but not considering a realisation in the future as relevant. We first deal with the first possibility and come back to irreal wishes below: In the following example from a letter on the Silk Road the -gU form receives a possessive suffix to refer to the subject and the nominal subject appears in the genitive: kutsïnï ... bergüsi ârtï. bermâdi, mân öttädüm. sâkïz on beş [kar]s mân berdïm. ... bo munçä kars kutsïda algu ol (HamTouHou 34,11) ‘K. should have given ... (for scissors); he didn’t give it (and) I paid it: I gave 85 (pieces of) woolen cloth. ... This much woolen cloth should be taken from K.’. Further examples appear in confessions; in the Manichean Xw with -mAk and -sXk: on çaxşap(i) tutdokumuzta bârtu uč azgïn, uč könlü, uč älgïn bir kamag özün tüktï tuutmâk kârgâk ârtï (150) ‘Since we observe 10 commandments it was our obligation to observe fully three by the mouth, three by the heart, three by the hand and one by the whole person’; arïg baçap baçap täyrikä ancölasik kârgâk ârtï (177) ‘It was necessary to observe a pure fast and to dedicate it to god’; suyumuññi yazokumuññi boşayu öttünmâk kârgâk ârtï (185) ‘It was necessary to pray for forgiveness for our sins’. In a Buddhist confession (gU with and without kârgâk: bilingümülc ukungumuz kârgâk ârdi, isig amrak özümüzc üdalâmïçüç kârgâk ârtï, adnâgûnç isig özün üzmâgümüçÖ783 ârtï, âdîn tönlî òglinm ünlâmâgümüç ümgâmâgümüç kârgâk ârtï (UigSün5-8) ‘We should have been aware of ourselves, given up our dear life, not have ended the lives of others and not have angered or caused pain to other living beings’. Such sentences are followed by prayers for forgiveness in case the confessant carried out such deeds. These are not, therefore irreal wishes. kârâk ærdi sän mä munî ukst sän (QB 658) siginîfs ‘It was necessary (not ‘it would have been necessary’) for you as well to understand this’; this does not express an outdated necessity but is the QB construction -sA kârâk transferred into the past.

With -gULXk är- the necessity holds for the object of the verb and not its subject: titgüläk ök ærûr (TT VIII D37) is ‘It definitely has to be given up’. This construction is apparently shared by the category of ‘ability’ (section 3.253) and volitive modality.

The modal content of -gU is also made irreal by preterite forms of är-, e.g. in QB 1089: máníç kîkîmî aydim ârdi sança / könl bâmgû ærdîç

---

Ö783 The editor wrote ‘Nach üzmâgümüç scheint k(ä)rgâk zu fehlen’; in view of the variation in the modal phrases and bergüsi ærtï in the letter quoted above, any such addition seems unnecessary.
ämdi maga ‘I had told you my (fickle and inconstant) nature; you should not now have fastened your heart to me’.

5.3. The reflexion of social structure

Verbal communication reflects social as well as personal and spiritual hierarchies. This is expressed by honorifics such as kut when used for addressing humans, e.g. kaŋ im kutë ‘my honoured father’ in KP 4,4; or, when a letter is addressed to pr(a)tyadiveči ačari adakınya (HTs VII 2063) ‘to the feet of master Prajñādhvaja’.

Another example is the expression nomlug at’özüzï ‘your (pl.) dharma body’, used for referring to the addressee in HTs VII 2080 in the same letter, which is not loan-translated from the Chinese original. tägrim, literally ‘my god’, happens to have received pragmatic specialisation together with the possessive suffix: It signifies ‘Your majesty!’ when used in direct address, or sometimes in deferential reference to an absent person. This is not a case of lexicalisation, however, since contexts such as măniy t(ä)grim, alıpim, bàgräkim ‘My god, my hero, my noble one!’ (M II 7,8) with the genitive of the 1st person pronoun show that the connection with the speaker was definitely kept up.

In the verbal domain deference is expressed by auxiliaries such as yarlï(g)ka-, approximate translation ‘to graciously do something’. The original meaning of yarlïka- was ‘to pity, commiserate’, whence metonymy leads to deferential meaning when referring to actions of subjects in high position whom one honours or just wants to be polite to. The reason for its specialization to speech with meanings such as ‘to order’ or ‘to say’ is no doubt the fact that absolute rulers acted through their words. yarlïka- is exceedingly common; here just two examples: atayu yarlïkazunlar (M I 29,16; 30,17-18) ‘may they please call out (my) name’ or alkiš başiš sözlägüg, … amv(a)rd(i)šı qılip yığınıg ayu y(a)rlïkadïnüz olarka (Pothi 226-7) ‘Thou hast commanded them to say blessings and hymns, … to concentrate their mind and meditate’.

In the following clause yarlïka- is added to a nominal predicate, as a polite replacement for the copula: tükäil bilgä täyri [täyris]ji burxan bo yertincüf[da] aş[an] yarlïkar ärkin … (HTs III 601) ‘While the perfectly wise Buddha, god of gods, graciously was in good health in this world, …’; a further such example occurs in HTs VII 1057. Governing a place name in the dative, without a lexical verb or a predicative adjective, yarlïka- signifies ‘to come to a certain place’ (the way buyur- can be

---

684 Röhrborn emends this to ‘Prajñādeva’.
used in Turkish): onunč ayın lagkika yarlïkâdi (HTs VII 936) ‘On the 10th month he came to Luo-yang’.

The humility counterpart of yarlïka- ‘to say’ is ötün-, literally ‘to pray, submit a petition’; its humility counterpart in the sense of ‘doing graciously’ is tägin- ‘to take the liberty to do’. ötün- and tägin- are used for marking speech and action respectively, of the individual who has an inferior status. The auxiliary ötün- appears e.g. in kältöküm bo tep ötünti ‘He said ‘These are (the circumstances of) my coming’ (KP 61.2). In [subu]di ... ötünti ayıttı [ät]özülg savıg köngüldä kılmamakig (BT I F 47) ‘Subhüti ... begged to ask about the non-creation of bodily matters in the heart’ both verbs are finite. tägin- appears e.g. in bo ğımig iki kata okïyi tä gintim (M I 29.9-14, Manichean) ‘I endeavoured to recite this healant twice’ or ötüg bitig kïlip ... üdu tägintimiz (HTsPek 89r11) ‘we have humbly prepared a petition and sent it’. In kamag bursağ kuvragdïn iki toyïn ötünü täginür män (Mait fr. quoted in the n. to TT I 160) ‘I venture to invite two monks from all communities’ we find the two politeness verbs combined. Occasionally, the construction is different: [b]o kutlug künüg küssülg täginür ärtimiz (M III nr.15, 34.13) ‘We have been humbly wishing for this blessed day’. See section 3.25 for similar constructions with the vowel converb.

The sentence tükäl Tämür tü-izïndïm koyn yïl onunč ay beš ötueka şaçu balïkta (AvadShög XI b5) signifies ‘I the lowly slave T. have written down all of it; the 25th of the 10th month, the year of the sheep, in the city of Sh.’: tü is a loan from Chinese, reflecting the old pronunciation of Chinese nu ‘slave’; therefore tü-yküy, with the so-called diminutive suffix, is approximately ‘lowly slave’. This is one example for self-depreciation found in Uygur texts; further examples of +k(I)yA in the service of modesty appear in OTWF 50.

Politeness is not, of course, necessarily a matter of social (or other) positioning. Another indication of deference is the use of the 3rd person for the addressee; e.g. in the following address to a brother, where it appears together with the verb yarlïka- and vocative particle (y)a: öïdidï yarlïkazun eïm-a, kim ... ‘Please hear, dear brother, that ...’ (Suv 608,23). Similarly, among the same brothers: azkya öïrä yorïyu turzunlar; män una basa yetdim (Suv 615,14) ‘Please walk on a bit; I will have reached you in a moment!’ See TT X 19 and 179 and U III 36,9 for further examples. The sentence täygrikânimiz üzün özin kalïn kütun turkaru adasazan médica bolzun ârti (BT V 516-8) ‘Our majesty, I wish he were to attain a long life, that he were to live full of blessing and that he were continuously free from trouble’ again shows the 3rd person, beside, of course, the title täygriän and the irre
form of the imperative where a very real wish is obviously being expressed (as shown by the context). With the polite 3rd person imperative used for the 2nd person we have bo kutsuz kovi tnilglar icin tars biligin ayig klincin ketarmak alin cavishin yarlikazan, tayrim, kim ukzun bilzunlar (TT VI 20-21) ‘May he, my lord, for the sake of these unhappy and wretched creatures tell us the means to remove their heresies and sins so that they may understand and know’. The following, in an address to Buddha from the same text, is similar: amti, tayrim, bo montag tars tatri biligilig tnilglarka koni yol orok kortguri bergay arti, kim koni yolca, koni biligica yorizunlar aarti, tars tatri toro kodzunlar aarti tayrim (TT VI 237-8) ‘I wish you would now, my Lord, graciously show such perversely thinking creatures the right way, so that they would walk along the right road, according to the right set of mind and should give up perverse teachings, my Lord’. The repeated use of tayri+m ‘my god’ as vocative, the 3rd person reference to the addressee and the addition of aarti to both the main and the subordinate clauses are all for politeness’ sake. The sentence bagim tegin natag yarlikasar ol yarliglig bitturgali anuk turur m'an (U III 47,11) ‘However my master the prince commands, I stand ready to carry out that command’ is addressed to the prince mentioned in it; we see that the 3rd person is used for the 2nd person out of politeness also in the indicative. The most wide-spread sign of politeness is the use of the plural in the 2nd person pronoun (siz instead of san) when referring to the addressee, and in 2nd person verb forms with the addressee as subject. Thus the father of the good-thinking prince (KP 4,6) asks his son: amrac oglum, na icin busushlug kalilijiz ‘My dear son, why have you come in sadness?’. The plural polite counterpart of this form would have been kalilijilar. Similarly in the imperative, kaliy can be used politely for the singular, kaliljar for the plural. In anvamig yutuzlu al(i)nin ‘Take yourself A. as wife!’ (M III 14,4) the addressee is also, of course, singular. In rare cases honorific plurality even applies to nouns, as kulug bodis(at)varlar armaxar bo yerkai nay tagmagay arti (KP 45,3-5) ‘If he weren’t a blessed bodhisatva he would not have been able to reach this place at all’, said of a single person.
CHAPTER SIX

NOTES ON THE LEXICON

The lexicon reflects the occupations of speakers and writers as well as their spiritual world. While the runiform inscriptions of the steppe empires have numerous horse colour terms, for instance, Uygur texts written by monks abound in religious terminology. While much of this latter terminology is borrowed, there also are numerous copy coinings: *tuyunmiš*, e.g., means ‘enlightened’ and thus corresponds to *buddha*, its Sanskrit source, and *tuyunmak* is equivalent to Sanskrit *bodhi* or ‘enlightenment’. Scholars working on Uygur sources have been much interested in religious terminology; the fact that such a great portion of extant texts is religious makes a thorough understanding of this terminology essential for understanding them. With time, other semantic domains will also have to be looked at in greater detail; Ingeborg Hauenschild’s work on animal and plant terminology (e.g. Hauenschild 2003) can here serve as model. Dankoff & Kelly 1985: 247-274 have classified all the lexemes found in the DLT into semantic domains and subdomains. Their overall domains are nature (with subdomains such as astronomy, weather, time, light and dark, land features and many more), animals and plants, daily life, society, spiritual life, human characteristics, activities and miscellaneous actions, the senses, abstractions and miscellaneous relationships, particles (including, among other things, a very rich collection of onomatopoeics). With this they took the first steps in research into lexical fields. Many entries in the UW constitute valuable and rich material for lexical research into Uygur, but it has as yet managed to cover only a small part of the lexicon of that largest part of Old Turkic. What we can here offer are only a few remarks on some lexicon-related matters.

When dialects differ in the lexical domain, this is by no means in all cases linked to different living conditions or to different cultures; here is one example for what I mean: *sezik* ‘doubt’ (together with *seziksiz* ‘doubtless, undoubtedly’) is highly common in Buddhist texts but not in Manichaean ones; it was also borrowed into Mongolian. Manichaean sources have *sezinč* (and *sezinčsiz*) instead (documented in OTWF 279-80). Both lexemes are, of course, derivates from *sez(i)*- ‘to have an apprehension’, but speakers of different dialects happen to have made different choices concerning the formative to use for this particular
content. Similarly, ‘beautiful’ is only körtlä in Manichaean texts but either körtlä or körklä in Buddhist ones, both forms ultimately coming from kör- ‘to see’. An example from the verbal domain is alkan-, which is used beside its synonym alka- ‘to call out invocations (both in cursing and praying for somebody)’ in Manichaean texts, while Buddhist texts only have alka- (cf. OTWF 587-8).

One characteristic of the Old Turkic lexicon is the significant number of set expressions such as or ara kir- ‘to intercede’, which consist of a noun and a verb. We have set combinations with Turkic as well as with foreign nominals, e.g. asiq tusu kil- ‘to benefit somebody’ and kšanti kïl- ‘to confess’. Orkhon Turkic xagan olor-, literally ‘to sit (as) king’, signifies ‘to rule’. šük tur- ‘to stay quiet’ comes from an onomatopoeia. Another phrase with an intransitive verb is tuš bol- ‘to meet’, which (unlike šük tur- and xagan olor-) governs direct objects. Such instances are all lexicalised: Free object incorporation is not found in Old Turkic. One well-known domain for lexical phrases are the euphemisms and circumlocutions used for ‘dying’, kärgäk bol-, tägrï bol- ‘to become divine’ or yok bol- in Orkhon Turkic or âtöz kod- ‘lay down one’s body’ in Uygur (U III 80,6): uč- ‘to fly (off)’ or uča bar- ‘to fly off’ were also used with this meaning. Orkhon Turkic kärgäk bol- is a euphemism, but Uygur apparently still has it only in its literal meaning, ‘to become needed’. The QB is particularly rich in loan-translated expressions copied from Persian.

Set expressions should be distinguished from internal object constructions such as yol yori- ‘to travel’ (e.g. in MaitH XX 13r16), the common nom nomla- ‘to preach’ or ant antïk- ‘to swear an oath’: yol, nom and ant in these examples appear as dummy objects where no other explicit objects are to be mentioned. What is interesting about the last-mentioned phrase is that +(X)k- verbs (dealt with in OTWF section 5.44) are otherwise all intransitive, so that ant is unlikely to be filling an object slot. Though the conditioning for the appearance of such dummy objects is syntactic, their choice is phraseological. őlüt őlür- ‘to carry out a massacre’ and čašat čašur- ‘to slander’ (OTWF 310-11) are another type of figura etymologica, as syntagms consisting of etymologically related words are called, in which the eymological connection is certain but more opaque. On the other hand it happens that certain implied objects are left implicit, such as sekirt- ‘let (one’s horse) jump’, yügürt- ‘let (one’s horse) run’ or the cases presented in Röhrborn 2000. In Tuñ 35 taŋ ün-tür-û is ‘making (the army) get up at dawn’.
A quite conspicuous feature of the lexicon are binomes and biverbs: Numerous lexemes are used in fixed two-word sequences to render a single notion. They are either synonyms, as inscrptional kü sorug ‘fame’, Uyghur aš azuk ‘food’ (examples quoted or mentioned in UW 327), oč kāk ‘revenge’ (and oč kāk al- ‘take revenge’), tōz yīltīz ‘root’ or, in legal language, čam čarīm ‘objections’; more rarely, they are determinative sequences as isīg öz ‘life’, literally ‘warm core’. Thirdly, they can be complementary antonyms, as yer suv ‘country; the earth, the material world’.685 This last is not fused morphologically, as we find e.g. the accusative yerīg suvūg in BT V 213. The joined spelling of the expression in TT X 371 is, nevertheless, iconic for lexical fusion. tsuy erinčū ‘sin’ is an example for a different matter to look out for when dealing with binomes: The first element is of foreign (Chinese), the second of Turkic origin. Examples for adjective couples are tütrüm tārīq ‘profound’ and bay baramlīg ‘wealthy’, while yarok yalṭĭk ‘gleam(y), bright(ness)’ is used both nominally and adjectivally. All three show the strong tendency to alliteration, found also in aš azuk and čam čarīm. ārt- bar- ‘to pass’, sāv- amra- ‘to like’, oz- kutrul- ‘to be saved’ and ter- kuvrat- ‘to assemble’ are examples for biverbs. The last three biverbs show the other strong tendency of placing the longer term second; this tendency can be observed also in bay baramlīg, aš azuk and čam čarīm. In ka kadaś ‘kinsmen’, yavīz yavlak ‘bad’, yul yulak ‘springs’, yūz yūzūgū or yok yodun kīl- ‘to annihilate’ the two elements are etymologically related. The last four instances as well as yadagīn yalṭīn ‘barefoot and naked’, yāyolk yazok ‘erroneous’ (< yaz- yajṭīl-, where the longer element comes second), yakin yaguk ‘near’, yaroyaśu- ‘to gleam’, yayīl- yaykal- ‘to shake and rock’, yitīl- yokad- ‘to disappear’, yumṣak yavaś ‘gentle’, yunēḥīg yavīz ‘evil’ all show the particularly common alliteration with /y/.

Alliteration is the instrument of rote rhyme, which dominates poetic structures both in Buddhist and Manichaen verse: Words do not rhyme at the end of stanzas but at their beginning, in the manner of the alliterating couples mentioned. For rote rhyme, however, not only the consonant is important, as in binomes and biverbs, but also the vowel in the alliterating syllable; couples like yītīl- and yokad- would therefore be of no use for rote-rhyme. The Old Turkic rote-rhyme appears to have been visual and not auditory: o can rhyme with u, ṝ with ū, i with i and

685 N. Sims Williams has, in different publications, pointed out that this corresponds to binomes in Bactrian, Khotanese and Mongolian which signify ‘irrigated land, landed property’. Mongolic yejar usu appears (e.g. in the Secret History and in Ordos) to have the same sacral meaning yer suv has in Turkic.
and the like. Zieme 1991 is the most authoritative and exhaustive treatment of this topic.

External influences on the lexicon came mainly from Chinese, Sogdian, Sanskrit and Tokharian. Qarakhanid borrowed from Arabic, Persian and other Iranian languages. The vast majority of lexemes copied from other languages is nominal. Both the Qarakhanids and the Uygurs made great efforts to translate foreign ideas, in many respects well surpassing copy coinings in modern Turkic languages.

Loan translation is a domain which would benefit much from further exploration; it occurs, e.g., when we find kil-inč ‘deed’ translating Skt. karma because that comes from the root kr ‘to do’. There are numerous such cases, e.g. the verb sūz-ül- ‘to have faith’ which is calqued on Skt. pra-śād ‘to settle down’ > ‘to become limpid (because this happens after impurities settle in a liquid)’ > ‘to attain peace, faith’. ādğiń barmiń (Warnke 195) is copied from Skt. sugata consisting of su ‘well’ and the perfect participle gaita from the root gam ‘to go’. Uygur has the adverbial instrumental ādğiń-n and the perfect participle bar-miś-ler ‘the ones who walked’. We also have many cases where a calque takes place in a particular context but has not been adopted by the language as a whole. Cf. the passive verb stem form yorí-l- from intransitive yorí-, which was created to translate the Skt. medio-passive caryate in Kinkashō A,d because the root car is a synonym of yorí-. Maue 1989 deals specifically with loan translations from Sanskrit in Sanskrit-Uygur bilingual Brähmi texts, where Sanskrit has a preverb. In some cases which he mentions, such as anubadhnaśi = eyin ulalur ‘is joined’ or vairāgya = āgyi bodolmak ‘lack of passion’ the connection seems clear. In others which he mentions, such as birgāru yiğiṭ- ‘to gather (intr.)’, örö kötör- ‘to lift up’ or örö tur- ‘to stand up’ the fact of copying is not so evident. The author says that tur- is also used for the meaning ‘to stand up’, but it is a fact that Old Uygur tur- was a highly polysemic verb which was in need for specification. The question of what is copied and what is not, what is copied ad hoc and what has become a naturalised collocation in most cases needs more elaborate and detailed study before one can make such statements. The same holds for Röhrborn 1983, an important paper on this matter, and for Laut 2003, the most recent contribution in this domain: In the great majority of cases, the expressions Laut mentions (divided into “Lehn- schöpfungen”, “Lehnbedeutungen”, “Lehnbildungen / Lehnubersetz-
un gen” and ‘Lehnübert ragung’) are indeed clearly calques. Are we sure, however, that the Old Turks needed a Sanskrit source to think of ayig kilinc as ‘sin’ or ämgäk as ‘suffering’? These and numerous other terms were of course conceived of by Buddhists within the Buddhist way of looking at the world, but that would be true of practically every concept.

In Erdal 1982 and in greater elaboration in OTWF section 2.91 we mentioned that the metaphorical use to which Uygur +IXg is put (see section 4.122) was probably copied from Tokharian, the ultimate source being Sanskrit. Pinault 2003: 47-53 studies this phenomenon by comparing the Mait passages in which the corresponding Tokharian suffix appears with the Uygur translations of these passages. He also points out that Khotanese also has a suffix secondarily put exactly to this use, thus showing that the phenomenon is truly areal.

Semantic shift within Old Turkic is another domain to be explored. It takes place e.g. in the words yaman, ayig and yawz which, beside signifying ‘bad’, also got to be used to mean ‘very’ (e.g. BT V 372). Another common phenomenon involving semantic shift is the movement of both nominal and verbal lexemes from concrete to abstract meaning.

The study of Old Turkic phraseology should, of course, go beyond the lexeme collocations dealt with above. One common instance for a whole sentence used phraseologically is the expression taki nay aytimiş kärgäk + accusative, which literally signifies ‘What more is there to ask about (obj.)’; here are two examples among many: tägri tägrisi burxan irig yawgan köngüllük yak içgäknig könlün ymä tüzün yavaş kilu yarlıkadi; taki nay aytimiş kärgäk kisi azunin bulmiş yalıuklarlig (TT X 15) ‘Buddha, the god of gods, has graciously softened the hearts of coarse and evil yaksas and bhūtas; the more so (or ‘not to speak of’) persons who have attained human existence’; birök yüz öni ani tāg bāglar bolsarlar, muntada bolup utgalı yegädlä ugeluk [ăr]mäzlär, taki nay aytimiş kärgäk yalıyız bir, kalmaşapadi eliğig (U III 9,22) ‘Even if there would be 100 separate lords like him they would not be able to be present and manage to vanquish (me), not to speak of one king Kalmäsapāda alone’.

What needs to be explored beyond phraseology are formulas characterising typical forms of texts, such as fables on one end of the spectrum, medical recipes or legal contracts on its other end; nor has there yet been any systematic study of Uygur religious formalisms and their degree of dependence on specific foreign models. Text linguistic methods have been applied only to the Orkhon inscriptions (but not e.g.
to the inscriptions of the Uygur Steppe Empire which follow these to a large extent). Let me here only mention a single Buddhist feature, the opening sentence of each of the chapters of the Maitrisimit, a text describing the coming of the last Buddha, which runs as follows: \textit{antï bo nomlug savïg ... +dA ukmïš kärgâk} ‘Now this dharma matter should be imagined in (place)’; this localises the content of the chapters in particular places in the holy geography of Buddhist scripture. Practically the same formulation is found also in the beginning of the \textit{ava\textit{d}âna} text edited in TT X (lines 31-33): \textit{antî bo savïg magat ulu\textit{š}ta ... bilmiš ukmïš kärgâk} ‘Now this matter should be known and imagined (to have taken place) in the land of Magadha’.

Research on such and other pre-formulated units of Old Turkic language must be left to a different study.
This bibliography includes all work I have found which describes and discusses the Old Turkic language. Publications of Old Turkic texts, writings which deal with the content of these texts or papers only trying to further their interpretation without making statements on the language as such have not been mentioned here, although the indirect contribution of these latter to our understanding of the language is, of course, highly valuable. Nor has general work on Turkic languages and their reconstructed prehistory been included, unless specific passages relevant to our topics are quoted in the present book. Adam et al., 2000 is an excellent bibliography covering all research relating to the early Turks though not quite complete concerning linguistic matters. Old Turkic sources are referred to in the same way as in the OTWF, taking over the abbreviations of the UW whenever available. The fact that the publication of the UW fascicles has been disconnected in recent years has meant that I have had to resort to practically full references when quoting out of relatively recent text editions; any future editions of the present work should use standardized quotation for all texts, assuming that publication of the UW continues or that a list for text naming is agreed upon in some other way.
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habitual subject 156
haplology 123, 226n.
harmony fluctuation 96
headless relatives 448
‘helping vowels’ 18,
26, 35, 111
honorific plurality 530
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<td>oblique base</td>
<td>31, 133, 186, 194, 196, 199, 201, 204, 336, 397-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obscenities</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oguz</td>
<td>9, 11, 14n., 53n., 64, 72, 78, 151n., 237, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Old Turkic’</td>
<td>4, 6, 9-11, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-by-one selection</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ongoing action</td>
<td>252, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset clusters</td>
<td>105-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset consonants</td>
<td>99-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset devoicing</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opening slots</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optative</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral characteristics</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinals</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientational suffix</td>
<td>174, 181, 205, 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palæography</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parasitical alveolars</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant tasks</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle of necessity</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participles</td>
<td>10, 153, 250, 278, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particles</td>
<td>245, 327, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participative relationship</td>
<td>163, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participative-locative</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>228, 433-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect participle</td>
<td>294, 298, 449-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanent qualities</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person–number category</td>
<td>232-3, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal pronouns</td>
<td>192, 195, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petrified converbs</td>
<td>312, 315-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic dependence</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phraseology</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place relativization</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural agreement</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plurality</td>
<td>158, 162-3, 165, 195, 237, 239, 246, 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite wishes</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>163, 237, 350, 493, 515, 520-21, 529-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polygons</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘possessive’</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive conjugation</td>
<td>233-4, 296, 318, 442, 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive constructions</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive dative</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive suffix 3.sg.</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postclitics</td>
<td>342, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpositional phrases</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpositions</td>
<td>197, 314, 327-30, 474-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpositive conjunctions</td>
<td>329, 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-predicative position</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-terminality</td>
<td>252, 268-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘postverbals’</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential objects</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative ablative</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative adjectives</td>
<td>364, 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative dative</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative genitive</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicative participles</td>
<td>233, 290, 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-established topics</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparative converb</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-preterite</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present perfect</td>
<td>255, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentatives</td>
<td>202, 354-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present renewal</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumption</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presupposed truth</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prevention</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privative</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-adverbs</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proclitics</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professions &amp; characteristics</td>
<td>148, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive variants &amp; texts</td>
<td>12-13, 19-20, 35, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected action</td>
<td>303, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projection participles</td>
<td>13, 281, 449, 454, 472, 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prolate ablative</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prolate equative</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prominent first position</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promises</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘pronominal’ +n+ 160-62, 167-8, 191, 195, 199, 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal base</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal copula</td>
<td>205, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal dative</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun declension</td>
<td>168, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prop words</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper names</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘proper’ postpositions</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Turkic 2, 5, 10-11, 11, 21, 196n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-verb-phrases</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proverbs</td>
<td>284, 318, 320, 401, 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-verbs</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proximative</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qarakhand</td>
<td>8-9, 115, 163, 197, 215, 230, 236, 242, 253, 260-62, 350, 495, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantification</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question incorporation</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation particles</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation strategy</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readiness to act</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘reduced vowels’</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referential-denotative</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflexive verbs</td>
<td>191, 229, 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regressive sibilant assimilation</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relational nouns</td>
<td>327-8, 332, 372, 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relational possessive suffix</td>
<td>181n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative clause adjacency</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative clauses</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative conjunction</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative pronouns</td>
<td>217, 448, 454, 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeated action</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reportive</td>
<td>273-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘result’</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative present</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative state</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumptive pronouns</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumptive reference</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reversive verbs</td>
<td>229, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhematization</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhetorical questions</td>
<td>416n., 430, 494n., 516, 518-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right dislocation</td>
<td>428-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right-branching</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rote rhyme</td>
<td>53n., 533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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rounding 11, 14-15, 92-94
runiform script 4, 38-40, 63
runiform sources 293, 301, 338, 375
scope 275n., 327-8, 337, 342, 347, 463
secondary case 30, 197
secondary converbs 318
secondary stems 291
self-depreciation 529
semantic shift 535
semantic subordination 509
sentence adverbs 329
sentence particles 328
sentence-internal reference 512
set expressions 532
shared predication 420, 470
shared suffixes 509
similarity 377
similative 179, 196, 201, 377
simultaneity 459
small clauses 307
social positioning 247
sociative meaning 361
sonants 69, 78, 84, 109, 121
sorrow 353
source relativisation 441
speaker’s volition 515
spelling 19, 45, 80, 86
spoken language 17
states 251
static local dative 367
status 245, 272
stress 98, 215, 232, 322, 423, 427
stress ing subjects 209
strong consonants 62
stylistic variation 376n.
subject 163, 320, 361, 424
subject deletion 498
subject participles 282, 296-7
subject pronoun 245
subject qualifiers 438
subject relativisation 443
subject sharing 508
subordinated mood 525
subordinating conjunctions 340
subordination 337, 462
‘such and such’ 201
suffix ordering 138
suffix sharing 232
suffixation 137-8
’Suffixaufnahme’ 170
suitability 305, 307
summary 509, 511
superfluous alefs 16
superlatives 151
supine 249-50, 281, 308, 317
suppletion 314
surprise 353
switch reference 164
syllable onset 106
syncopation 17, 59, 97-98, 106-7
synharmonism 39, 86, 128, 133, 162, 335
tag questions 324, 519
target 433
target language 377
task assignment 419
taxi 245, 262-3
temporal content 318-9
temporal datives 367
temporal expressions 187-8
temporal instrumental 379
temporal locative 371
temporal nominative 365
temporal postpositions 402
tense 245, 262
text organisation 382
textual frequency 168
‘there’ deixis 208
Tibetan script 42
time adverbs 331
time relativisation 442
time units 226
topic chain 511
topic deletion 455, 484
topicalisation 210, 346, 348, 414, 424-5, 431
trace demonstratives 417
transformation 322
transition into states 256, 271
transitivity 229, 417, 432
transposition 138n., 142
tripartite nominal sentences 412, 415
two-tier case systems 196
‘types of inaction’ 228
unlikelihood 277
unrounding 89, 95, 412
unstable vowels 127
urgency 522
variable argument 419, 435, 486, 498-500
velars 29, 44, 53-4
veracity 349
verb & noun 142
verbal deference 528
verbal plurality 11, 230-32, 434
verbless object clauses 451
verbless relative clauses 388
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs of thought, sensation &amp; speech</td>
<td>364, 409, 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivid past</td>
<td>240, 263, 266-7, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocative</td>
<td>351-3, 361, 416, 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice alternation</td>
<td>18, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice assimilation</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice opposition</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stop allophones</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless sibilants</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volitional clauses</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volitional verb forms</td>
<td>233, 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel alternation</td>
<td>191-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel attraction</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel converbs</td>
<td>249, 311-14, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel length</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel raising</td>
<td>92, 95, 192n., 197, 202, 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel reduction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel sequences</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowels</td>
<td>27, 41-42, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vying &amp; cooperation</td>
<td>228, 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wackernagel’s law</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak consonants</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather and environment</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight units</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word formation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word order</td>
<td>306n., 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written language</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenisey inscriptions</td>
<td>352, 354, 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes / no questions</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero, morphological</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero anaphora</td>
<td>358, 429, 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero derivation</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero reference</td>
<td>406, 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero slots</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zetacism</td>
<td>30, 84-85, 203, 332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF OLD TURKIC ELEMENTS

This is a listing of grammatical elements or of lexemes linked to grammatical tasks documented by Old Turkic sources as quoted in the present work. Elements quoted from other languages or from work of other scholars are not included. Capital letters, which symbolise archphonemes, are listed after small letters. Numerals refer to pages (main text or footnotes).

/a/ 14, 42, 50, 90, 93, 97
/a/ 47
adïn 334, 393, 401
alku 191, 217, 225, 231, 420
alku+gu, alku+gun 176, 226
amarï, amarïlarï 163, 226
an+ 126, 199, 205-6
+an 126, 199, 205-6, 327, 505, 511
an+ča 201-3, 206, 213, 327, 505, 511
an+ča bärü, an+ča ken 203
an+ča 202, 213
an+čadïn 205
an+čadïn bärü 203
an+čagïn 202
an+ča+kya 139-140, 202
an+ča+yma 206, 516
an+čan 202
an+čïp 201, 206, 327, 339, 511
an+čula, an+čulayu 92, 198, 202-3
an+čulan 203, cf. antîran, antaran
and antran
andîrîn 203
anî 200
anî ičïn 512
anî+ča 201
anîlayu 198, 201
anîn 200, 236, 314, 487, 512
anîş 381
anînïda, anînïdïn ken, anînïsîzï 197, 205
anîta 173, 205, 476, 512
antâca, antâça, antâda, antadan, antâdin, antâdata bärü 203-4
antakî 205
antag 126, 133, 193-4, 201, 212, 336, 429, 445, 447; cf. antâg.
antag antag 201
antak, anta ak 125
antâki(y)a ak 106
antaran 203 cf. andîran
antâg 126; cf. antag.
antîn sigâr 216, 503
antîran, antran 203
aya, ajar 18, 178, 200
ajaru 200, 206
ap, ap ... ap 338, 509
apam, apaŋ 341, 496
ara+kï 187
artok, artok+i 42, 169, 221
ašnu 188, 205, 223, 331
ašnu+ča 287
ašnukï 188
ašnurak 150
ayï 18, 345
azu, azu ... azu 338, 406, 509
azu+ča 287, 326
/A/ 38, 46, 59, 89-90, 99, 123 127-8
+A (part of proper names) 144
+A (variant of dative suffix with 1st and 2nd person possessives) 184
+A- 90, 128, 149, 228
-Å 127-8, 311, 458
+(A)d- 128, 228
AgU > A 123, 243
+(A)gU(n+) 25, 80, 127-8, 160-61, 167, 169, 176, 183, 191, 211, 225-6
AgUt 128, 146
+Ak 145
INDEX OF OLD TURKIC ELEMENTS

*(A)lI 10, 237
-(A)lIm 10-11, 127-9, 230, 236-7
+(A)n 60, 99, 128, 158 (plural suffix)
+An (variant of instrumental +xn)
+(A)r 132
-Ar 128, 131, 229, 240-41, 264, 454; cf. -r, -Ir, -Ur, -yUr.
Ar- 79, 128
+(A)r- 127-8, 228, 331
-Ar+ č 468
-Ar-č 468
-Ay, -AyI, -(A)yn 235
-(A)yIn 55, 128-130, 235, 521
ä 14, 45-7, 50-51, 300
ä /än/ 61
äki, äkin, äki+nti, äkirär 52, 88, 161, 221-3; cf. iki etc.
äkün < åkigü+n 52, 123
älig 50, 88, 97, 163, 220
äy 151, 163, 345
äy asnuki 223
äy mintin 205, 345
är-dök+in 245-6
är-dök täg 295
är-gäy 51, 120, 245, 262, 272, 277
är-igši 287
är-igmä 283
ärińe 276, 322, 328, 349
ärtp 245, 246
ärkän (< *ärür kän ?) 124, 252, 285, 287-8, 341, 477
ärki 31, 78, 120, 276-7, 322, 328, 350
är-ki 78-9, 118, 120-21, 285, 287-8, 341, 477
är[k]i 78, 121
ärmasär 338
ärmatin 245-6
ärmaț 268, 290, 324, 412, 519
är-miş 245-6, 268, 274, 301, 307, 310, 322
är-sär 216, 218-9, 245-6, 303-4, 307, 320-22, 324, 349, 425, 497
ärli 255, 266, 521, 523
ärli 245, 268, 272, 290, 299, 322
ät'üz 125, 149
[b] 15, 62-3, 65-6, 99, 102, 119
b > m 199
b > v, 63
bañça / bâña, bañaru 130, 194, 198
bar 48, 88, 91, 99, 225, 227, 324, 412, 416
bar- 99, 101, 214, 238, 247-9, 254, 323
barça 170, 225-6, 503
barč 217, 225
bašlayu, bašlayu+ča, bašla-yu+kï 223
baš+tïn+kï 188, 223
*bä 196
bän 10, 12, 99, 117, 123, 130, 133, 161, 191-2, 194-6, 198, 209, 234, 245, 332
bänig 198
bärü (< *bä+gerü ?) 101, 123, 178, 187, 195, 200, 206, 208, 296, 332, 402
ber- 51, 138, 261-2, 294, 420
bint 192, 195, 198
bintäg, bintägi 126, 133, 193, 213
bir 41, 101, 137, 139-40, 149, 155-6, 159, 161, 164, 177, 188, 223-4
bir ikinti birlä 191, 198
bir ikintikä, bir ikintškä 191, 223, 231
birlä 224
birlä 225
birlä, bir(l)si, birsi 1stš 141, 224
birlä, birt, bir(l)šl=än 18, 111, 176, 219, 278, 287, 312, 314, 322, 325-8, 333, 475, 481
birläki 187
INDEX OF OLD TURKIC ELEMENTS

birök 176, 337, 342, 496, 501
birök+in 326, 348
biz 123, 144, 147, 160, 163, 189, 192, 195-8, 209, 218-9, 222, 234, 455; cf. miz.
bizada, bizia, biziccilayi, biziya 197
biziy+tü+ci+cü 169, 197
biz, biziya 44, 195
bizincilikya 92, 198
bizinta 173, 196
bizda 196-7
bizlar 195
bizni 44, 195
bizinçülülän 92, 198
bizintä 173, 196
bizkä 196-7
biznilig 150, 196, 201
bIn 193
*bIn+ 94, 205-6
bo 18, 45, 123, 126, 133, 183, 191, 193, 195, 197, 199-201, 205-6, 210, 212-13, 219-20, 222, 224, 231-2, 332, 423
bol+ar+ta+ki+g 205
bol- 229, 245, 249-50, 255-6, 271-2, 276, 294, 322, 324, 409
bolçun, bolmazun 235
bol-gay 352
bol-or, bolar 90, 272
bol-up 219
bol-zun 90
bolgay 244, 272, 522
bolmaciç 289
bolü 272
bolu ber- 261
bolzuni 236
bun+ 94, 126, 183, 199, 205-6
hun/ hunta 173, 199
burun, burun+ki 18
büntägi 126, 193
*č/ 56, 70, 83, 103, 109, 193, 207 [č] 13, 113, 115
čak 266, 343
+čA 92, 128, 177, 190, 198, 202, 318-9, 322, 340, 376, 390, 468-9
+čA+kyA 139
+čA+IAYU 92, 177; cf. +čIAYU.
+čA+slg 139
+čI 129-31, 140, 148-9, 154, 177, 243, 279, 291-2
-čI 243
čI 345
+čIAYU 180; cf. +čA+IAYU.
+čU+ 177, 198
čU 345, 351, 522
-čUK 114, 152; cf. -kUç.
+čUIAYU 180, 190
[d] 62, 67-9, 100, 118, 121, 214, 315, 317
d ~ 8 67-8
/d/ > /y/ 9, 19, 121-2, 316
-ďr 234, 238, 246, 265-6, 273
+dA (~ +tA) 13, 15, 68-9, 92, 118-9, 121, 128, 150, 173-5, 188-9, 197, 204, 291, 372
+dA+kI 188, 387
+dAİ 11, 14, 68-9, 118-9, 149, 230, 233, 243, 250, 263, 270, 272, 282, 286, 288-90, 293, 321, 323, 421, 485, 508
-dAİär- 290
-dAİ ärı 270-1
-dAİ bol- 250
+dAm 91, 119, 128, 140, 146
+dAm / -dIn 13, 69, 119, 174-5, 281, 375
+dAm 140, 147
-dI / -ti 315
-dI 69, 141, 231, 239, 245, 273, 298
+dI 129; cf. +dI ~ +dl.
-dI+tr 231, 239
+dIn (~ +dAn) 13, 174-5, 181, 281, 376, 457
+dIn / +dUr 203
+dIn+tr 175
-dOk (~ -tOk) 27, 31-2, 69, 118-9, 129, 163, 215, 238-40, 242, 246, 281, 293-6, 298, 319, 375, 431, 440, 443, 454, 469, 484-5
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-dOk+dA 318, 320, 471
-dOkA Ok 472
-dOkA bärü 480
-dOk+ln (instrumental) 319
-dOk+ln ićän 319, 486
-dOk ićän 485
-dUm, -dUmUz 15-16, 93
+dX+ 197
+dXgXz 239
+dXm 68, 94, 265, 266
+dXmXz, -d+XmXz 15, 93, 238
+dXŋ 14
+dXn 109, 123, 129, 174-5, 181-2, 187, 205, 331, 333, 386, 406
+dXr+ 197, 203, 330
+dXrAn, +dXrIn 84
+dXrI 84, 182, 203, 327
[ö] 67-9, 118-9, 121
/e/ 12, 26-7, 42, 45, 50-52, 91, 107, 133
[e] 88
eyin, even 51, 334, 395
[f] 66-7, 117
[g] 78, 121, 172
+gA 9, 171-2, 184; cf. +kA.
+gA 128, 153-4, 207, 233, 242-3
+gAk 128, 152
+gAII 128-9, 154-5, 230, 247, 249-50, 257, 259, 278-9, 281, 308, 312, 317-8, 409, 479, 489-90, 494, 512
+gAl ak- 250, 317
+gAl av- 409
+gAl är- 244, 250, 255, 271, 308, 317, 409
+gAl bol- 259, 275, 317, 323, 409
+gAl kal- 250, 253, 260, 409
+gAl küsä- 410
+gAll ötün- 409
+gAll sakän- 410
+gAll tăgimlig 384
+gAll tur- 249-50, 254-5, 317, 409
+gAll u- 259, 409
+gAll ugra- 409, 410
+gAll ićän 308, 319, 327, 405, 490
+gAll yarlıka- 409
+gAllr 27, 244, 252, 255, 263, 271-2, 278, 307-8, 484
+gAllr ärkän 308, 478
+gAllr ätti 271
+gAllr ärär 301
+gAllr ärär 271
+gAllr ekän 308, 478
+gAllr ärä 301
+gAn bol- 256, 290
+gAr 178
+gAr- 79, 97, 177
+gArU 123, 128, 177-8, 200, 312, 374
+gAv 10-11, 14, 120, 153, 207, 233-4, 242-5, 263, 270, 272, 321, 520
+gAv ärdi 270, 521
+gAv ärdi 521
+gAv ärdi 278
+gAv Ok, -gAvSOk, -gAvSoK 128-9, 153
+gAv 120, 152; cf. -kI.
+gAv 186
+gAv 118, 129, 235, 351, 522; cf. gUl.
+gAv 225
+gAvčA (<-gAv(s)I(n)+čA) 153, 202, 317-8, 327, 479
+gAv- 248, 255
+gOk /-gOk 120, 129, 152
/gs/ /-gš/ 114
+gU 31, 349, 518
+gU 13, 18, 90, 128, 151, 260, 276-9, 281, 291, 301-5, 316, 442-3, 454, 472, 484, 526
+gU är- 305
+gU ärär, -gU ärämä, -gU kärgäk, -gU ol 526
+gUtäg 260, 276, 278, 306
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-gU üĉün</td>
<td>306, 308, 320, 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gU+dA</td>
<td>303, 319, 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gU+kA</td>
<td>306, 319, 360, 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gU+sI yok</td>
<td>277, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gU+sXz</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUč</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčA</td>
<td>468, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčA ārsär</td>
<td>305, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčI</td>
<td>14, 149, 153, 229, 282, 286, 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUč&lt;</td>
<td>125, 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčI</td>
<td>18; cf. -gUčI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčXk</td>
<td>13, 128-9, 147, 260, 301-3, 306-7, 414, 442, 454, 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčXk är-</td>
<td>260, 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčXk üĉün</td>
<td>308, 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUčXk+sI yok</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUr</td>
<td>229, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUr-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUrXz</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUrXz</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gUrXz</td>
<td>120, 129, 152; cf. -kXn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phono</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>69, 77-9, 117, 120-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>21, 30, 48, 53-4, 81-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*h</td>
<td>101-2, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>46, 55-6, 61, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>43, 88, 93, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i &gt; e</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ~ Ø</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idí</td>
<td>18, 122, 245, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikägü</td>
<td>166, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iki / āki</td>
<td>52, 88, 137, 161, 221, 330; cf. āki etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikilä, iki+läyü</td>
<td>223, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikin</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iki+ní / ākintí</td>
<td>137, 207, 223, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikintí kata, ikintísi</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikintí+läyü</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikintí+siç</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikintiškü</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikirär</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iki+sí</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iki+z</td>
<td>163, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il+ki</td>
<td>79, 190, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+in (instrumental suffix variant)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâ</td>
<td>56, 207, 209; cf. incâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâk (&lt; in+čâ ők)</td>
<td>59, 91, 207; cf. incâk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iŋaru, (i)ŋârû</td>
<td>196, 206; cf. ůngaru, ůŋaru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>46, 59, 61, 129, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I</td>
<td>127, 129, 311, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ñ</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(I)čA</td>
<td>132, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Ik</td>
<td>145-6, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(I)n+ (variant of possessive suffix)</td>
<td>162, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(I)n (variant of instrumental)</td>
<td>14, 175-6, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(I)ŋArU</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ir</td>
<td>129, 131, 240-41; cf. -r, -Ar, -Ur, -yUr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(I)sA-</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(I)t-</td>
<td>18, 110, 241; cf. -(X)t- / -(I)t-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ï/</td>
<td>42, 46, 52-61, 66, 81, 91, 93, 133-4, 206-7, 216, 301, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ï]</td>
<td>43, 91, 93, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i &gt; i, i ~ i</td>
<td>51, 56-7, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(nominative of demonstrative pronoun *in+)</td>
<td>207, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ~ yí</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iĊ</td>
<td>16, 126, 248-9, 251, 257, 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in+ (demonstrative)</td>
<td>130, 162, 205-8, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ůna</td>
<td>202, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ůnarù</td>
<td>104, 204, 206-8, 332, 402; cf. narù.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâ</td>
<td>56, 201, 206-7, 243, 332, 305, 511; cf. incâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâk</td>
<td>207; cf. incâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâma</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incâp / incâp</td>
<td>201, 206-7, 327, 332, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ůngaru, ůŋaru</td>
<td>200, 206, 332; cf. ůŋaru, (i)ŋârû.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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İntïn 205-8, 243, 332

[J] 70, 84

/k/ 44, 53-5, 75-7, 79-80, 88, 96, 117, 119, 121, 126, 128-9, 131, 172, 178, 287, 320, 388

[k] 78, 120-121

ka+, *ka 98, 191, 210, 212, 214-5, 340

kač 212, 214-5, 218

kač kata 214, 224

kaçan ~ ka'-ča+n 215, 218, 331, 481, 496

kaçanïn 216-7

kaçay kata 224

kal- 249, 253, 323, 409

kalï 215, 481, 496, 524

kalï (~*ka-la-in), k(a)lï 31, 203, 213, 215, 340, 470, 496

kamag, kamig, kamug 123, 225-6

kamagu < *kamag+agu 123, 226

kamagun 176

kamïgu+nï 191

kanda, kanta, kan+ta yan, kaña 214

kand(a)n 174, 214

kantaran, kantïran < kan+tar+an 203, 214

kañu (~*kaño ?), kañu, kanyu 12, 15, 71-2, 126, 210, 215-6, 502; cf. kayu.

kanyudun 181

kat-in kat-ìn 327

kat-a 224

kayda 216

kayul / kay’ ol, kayu ol 125, 215


kayutïn sï 216, 503

+kA 9, 112, 128, 137, 171-3, 179, 196; cf. +gA.

+kA- 228

kAn 344

käl- 247, 249, 253, 283

k(a)l- 60

kâm / kim 191-2, 210-12, 396, 499

kântï / kândï 44, 191, 208-10, 212, 218-19


*ke-č, ke-ča, ke+din, ke+n 179

kedin 123

kedirï 203

ken 123, 204-5, 333

kenïn 164

kenki 188

kerï (~*ke+gârû) 123, 178-9, 206

kesrâ (~*ke+sin+râ ?) 179, 296, 333, 401

kim biz, kim m(en) 218

kim kayu 155

kim+i, kim+inj 191, 211-2


kîmgän < *kîmgâ nañ 126

-kl 120; cf. -gl.

+kl 129, 156-7, 162, 170, 182, 186-91, 205, 223, 331, 373, 386, 393

+kl+čA 73

+klla7 71, 73-4, 106, 128-9, 137, 139, 145-6, 222, 515; cf. +k(l)lyA.

+klr~ 114, 228, 241

+k(l)ya (~ +klla7) 33, 73, 106, 139, 145-6, 529

kîl- 229, 420

kk > k 110

kodî 345

kÔk (~ O(k) Ok) 125

kör- 85, 99, 117, 132, 147, 163, 248, 258, 294, 524

körö 333

kudî 334, 396, 402, 404

-kUç 114; cf. -čuk.

kün+tüz 84, 203, 327

-kXn 120; cf. -gXn.
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-\text{m}Az 84-5, 99, 128, 241-2, 263, 284, 291; cf. \text{m}As.
-\text{m}Az \text{ärk}än 478
-\text{m}Azk\text{An} 124, 288, 342, 472, 478
\text{män}, \text{mn} 10, 12, 44, 99, 192-3, 198, 204, 209, 234, 245
\text{män}+\text{ig} 193
\text{män}+\text{iy}+\text{isz} 169
\text{mänč}ā 198
\text{mänč}i 15, 197
\text{mänč}iŋ 15, 197
\text{mänč}iŋ\text{ig} 169
\text{mänč}iŋ\text{isz} 169
\text{mänč}siz 196
\text{mänč}siz 196
\text{mänč}iŋ\text{a} 74
\text{mänč}ārā kālīp 194
\text{mın}dīdā 92, 197, 204
\text{mın} 192, 219, 231, 236
\text{mın}dīdā 196
\text{mın}iŋ 15, 192
\text{mını}, \text{mın}tā 192
\text{mın}tāda, \text{mın}tīdā 204
\text{mın}tīn 196
\text{mın}tīrīdīn, \text{mın}tīrītn 197, 203
\text{miz} 234; cf. \text{biz}.
\text{mın} (clitic 1\text{st} person pronoun) 193
-\text{mınš} ārū, 268-9
-\text{mınš} āl, 272
-\text{mınš} kārğāk 525
-\text{mınš} ol 243, 269
-\text{mınš} tāğ 469
-\text{mınš} tūr- 250
-\text{mınš} üčiŋ 319, 485
-\text{mınš} ā 468-9
-\text{mınš}+\text{dA} /-\text{mınš}+\text{tA} (bārū) 318, 320, 473-4, 480
-\text{mınš}+\text{dIn} 474
-\text{mınš}+\text{Im} 298
-\text{mınš}+\text{kA} 55, 240, 319, 486
+m\text{ı} /+\text{mXı} 220
mın+ 205
mın+čā 94, 205
mın+čin 94
mındīdā 197
mınta 205
mınta dīn 204
mıntıdā 197, 204
mıntın 206
-mınš+ka 130
mon+ tāg 193
montāg 126, 133, 193-4, 201, 212, 336
mun+ 206
muna 202, 206, 355-6, 521
mun+ča+kya 139
munčāda (bārē) 202-3
munčān 202
munčāluu 92, 198, 202
mundača 204
munđārīn 203
munī 194, 200, 205
munīlāyu 198, 201
munīn 200
munīndā, munīndīn 197
munisū 196, 201
munta 205
mun+ta+dā 94, 197, 204-5
munđānā 204
muntačā 205
munțin 206, 208
munțīran 203
munțuda 204
munun 200
muŋa, muŋar 18, 200
muŋ 94, 99, 128, 133, 137, 245, 342, 347, 349, 411, 430, 512, 516, 518
-mXr 93, 112
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+n+ 15, 161-2, 167, 180, 191, 195-6, 199, 206, 212, 330
+n# 158
n ~ y 74
naru 104, 206; cf. inaru.
nä + -(X)p 310
nä + -(X)ärsär 125, 219; cf. näärä.
nä nägü iš 211
nä ymä, nä yläg 217
nä +si 212
nä+čä 92, 212-15, 217, 453, 500, 503-4; cf. ničä.
näčä mä 495
näčäädä 202, 213, 215, 218, 481
näčäük, näčäkin, näčäkläti 213, 470, 482
nädä ötrö 505
nädä 212
nägü 211, 454
nägü < nägü (ö)k 123, 211
nägüdä ötgürü 211
nägü < nätäg ol 125
näkä 212
nälok, nälik 31, 60, 123, 213, 243
nämä 214
nämän 213
nämčä 212
näy 99, 213, 216-7, 346
närük, nä kärük 123, 125-6
närgäy, nä ärgäy, n(ä)rgäy 125, 322
nätäg, nä täg 133, 212-3, 336, 471, 503-4
nätägin, näätägläti 133, 213
näzä 125, 219; cf. nä ärzär.
[nd] 69
ničä 92; cf. näčä.
+nir 212.
+nI 18, 167, 170-1, 186, 191-2, 196, 205, 212, 225-6
+nI+ (pronominal intercalary element) 196
+nIy, +nUy 94, 169; cf. +(n)Xy.
*(nk/ > /ŋ/ 81
[nš] > [nč] 152
+nXy+dA 190
+(n)xy 61, 80, 128-9, 168-9, 195;
+nl +nUy
/ŋy/ 13, 74, 181
/ŋ/ 14-15, 29, 44, 80-81, 110-111,
117, 162, 169, 206, 219, 453
[ŋ] 80
/ŋ/ 12-13, 33-4, 62, 71-5, 80, 110,
181, 210
n > n 16
n > y 19, 34
n > yn 72
[ŋč] 95, 130
/o/ 42, 48-50, 88, 90-91, 129, 380
[o] 42, 88, 90-91, 129
o/i 27
-o/-ö 90; cf. -Ur.
oł 112, 202, 231
(ol+lar) 112, 202, 231
olar (< *ol+lar) 112, 202, 231
ona 202, 206
-or/-ör/-ür 90; cf. -Ur.
oš 199
/O/ 127, 129, 131, 412
Ok, (O)k 45, 91, 95, 125, 129, 133,
137, 150, 152, 154, 201, 207,
219, 242, 245, 310, 314, 342-3,
347, 425, 431, 472, 476, 512
-O(k) 99, 110, 127, 129, 132, 152
/ö/ 48, 81, 88, 91, 129, 380
[ö] 42, 88, 91, 106, 121
ögi 169, 176, 225, 314, 328
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Old Turkic Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>örki 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>öz=+in+i+çä 169, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>öz 144, 146, 149, 154, 169, 184, 186, 191, 208-10, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>özgä 170, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>özn / özín 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p/ 62, 65-7, 93, 95, 100-102, 116-7, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p/ 65, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[q] 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[q ~ x] 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/ ~ /z/ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r# &gt; /x# 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-r 85, 131, 240-42; cf. -Ar, -Ir, -Ur, -yUr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+rA 89, 131, 168, 178-9, 182, 187, 318, 333, 373, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+rU/ArA 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/rA- 114, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/rA+ 142, 150-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(r)Ar 128, 220, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r] 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[rg] 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/ 132, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/ 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/ 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/ 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+rU 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ry 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/ 83, 102, 116, 121, 128, 151, 162, 236, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+s 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sä &lt; saga 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa- 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>san+i+çä 15, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saga 80, 130, 192, 194, 218; cf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sänä. saga 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayu 335, 405, 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sA 15, 17-18, 72, 83, 112; cf. -sA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sA bol- 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sA käräk, -sA käräk ärdi 523, 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sAr 15, 17-19, 72, 83, 112, 128, 213, 215, 219, 234, 246, 266, 276, 309, 318, 320-21, 435, 448, 494, 499; cf. -sA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sAr ymä 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sääkiz on (-sääksön) 89, 115, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sän, sn 44, 130, 191-4, 197, 204, 214-5, 219, 230, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sänä 194; cf. saga. sänin 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sânindä, sänindin, säningsiz 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sänlär 195; cf. sänlär, sänlär. sälär 195; cf. sänlär, sänlär.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin+di+dä 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sindirtin 197, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinicähäyä 92, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sindä, sinidin 196-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sintä 192, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sintäädä, sintäidä 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siz 54, 133, 157, 160, 163, 165, 169, 192, 195, 200, 214, 225, 228, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siziq, szüg, szinizq 44, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szinizq, szinizürä, szinizä 192, 194, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szinizäg 126, 133, 194, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sizlär 195; cf. sänlär, sänlär. siznä 192, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szinizä 192, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szinizääläyä 92, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szinizäidä 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+sLg 129, 139-40, 142, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+sLL 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sln (clitic 2nd person pronoun) 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(s)ln+, +(s)ln+ 13, 55, 128-31, 150, 162, 167, 173, 175, 178, 184-5, 207-8, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(s)ln (accusative) 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(s)lnA 80, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+(s)lnArU 80, 185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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+(s)InLy 184
+slrA- 84, 87, 128-9, 149, 228, 297
+sxz 149
*ši 332
siyar 178, 208, 221, 332, 403, 483
siyara 162, 178, 208
/sk/ 198
soka / saka 331, 344
+šOOk 129, 153
+šOUn, -šOUnI 236
+šUn ərti 523
+šXk (- <šXk ?) / +šXg 13, 129, 163,
230, 234, 238, 242, 244, 248,
276, 279, 289, 301-2, 304, 440,
443, 454, 526
+šXk- 238, 244
+šXk- (< (X)z-(X)k-) 116, 121,
129, 228, 248, 434
+šXz 14, 61, 84, 87, 129, 139-40,
143, 149, 156, 177, 196, 228-9,
316
+šXzOn 176
/š/ 14, 65-7, 77-8, 83-4, 100, 102-3,
106, 109, 117, 124, 239, 296, 351
[s] 29
/t/ 67, 69, 103, 112, 114-6, 315, 317
[t] 69-70, 118
takï 150, 170, 337, 349, 478, 509
tap-a 66, 178, 333, 404
tAg, -tAg 133, 336; cf. täg.
täg 126, 133, 137, 164, 179, 189,
193, 201, 209, 212-3, 332, 340,
396, 404-5; cf. tAg. -tAg.
tägäl 412
tägi 188, 334, 399
t-e 51, 209, 283, 310, 325, 455,
504-5
te-gmä 283
tep 44, 492, 505
te-r 241
+tI ~ +dI 213, 223, 315, 330; cf. +dl.
tokaz on, tokson 89, 115, 220
tolp 225
/tu/ 97
°trI- 228
+trUk 97; cf. +ljdUrXk.
-trU° < -UrU° 97
u > ət 110
tur- 247, 249, 250-1, 255, 323,
325, 409
/turu/ 106
turur 250-51, 255, 305, 325-6, 413
-Ur- (~ -dUr-) 38, 69, 90, 116,
128, 229
-UrXl- 228, 433
tükä- 249, 256-7
tüzü, tüzü+gu 170, 225-6
tv > vt 86
-tXl- 97, 228, 299, 433
-tXz- 97, 228, 434
iz > iz 116
/ú/ 42, 59, 64, 88, 91, 93, 128
[u] 90
u- 126, 228, 248, 258-60, 275, 409
u-sar, u-yur 258
uläti 31, 169, 204, 403, 509
u-ma- 127, 230, 275, 311
una 202, 206, 266
/Ú/ 18, 46, 59, 61, 89-91, 93, 99,
128-9, 131, 158
[ú] 90
-Ú 90, 128, 258, 311, 458; cf. -o / -ö
+Ú 228
+ú ð 90, 128
-Ú alk- 250, 409
-Ú är- 250-52
-Ú bar- 250, 253
-Ú bašla- 249
-Ú ber- 262
-Ú bil- 260
-Ú birlã 327, 405, 475-6
-Ú bol- 259, 275
-Ú id-, -U kal-, -U käl- 250
-Ú ötün- 409
-Ú tur- 250
-Ú turur 264
-Ú tut- 250
-Ú tükä- 250, 409
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-U yarlïka- 409
-U yori- 250
-U uma-, -UmA- 127, 259
+(U)mUz / +(U)mXz 15, 93, 161
[uo, üo] 49
-Or 90, 128, 131-2, 229, 233, 240-41, 263, 282, 284-5, 287-8; cf. -or / -ör / -ür, -r, -Ar, -Ir, -yUr.
-Or- 38, 72, 128, 229
-Or ārkän 458
-Or+dA 318
-(U)t+č 149, 154
-(U)t 90, 132, 152, 238
+(U)t 128, 158
u- 126, 228, 248, 258-60, 275, 409
u-sar, u-yur 258
ulatï 31, 169, 204, 403, 509
u-ma- 127, 230, 275, 311
una 202, 206, 266
/iü/ 88, 129
[iü] 88
iüçän 141, 149, 154, 159, 161, 163, 170, 188, 278, 280, 296, 300, 302-4, 307-8, 404, 484, 487, 490
irü 31, 150, 179, 181-2, 280, 328, 333, 400, 405, 457
/v/ 62, 64-7, 95, 99, 102, 119, 123
[v] 63-66
/v ~ n/ 62
-vf 65, 129
/VrVs/ 124
[Vt[v] : [Vt[V]] 113
/w/ 64, 67
[w] 63-5
[x] 76-8, 117
xanda, xayu 77
xw 21
/X/ 38, 46, 59-61, 88, 90-91, 99, 127, 129, 131, 158, 169, 180, 185, 203, 301
+(X)č 145
+(X)d 229
+(X)g 18, 61, 129, 167, 170, 226
+(X)g 61, 90, 110, 132, 152-4, 317
+(X)gč 149, 153, 323
+(X)gč bol- 256
+(X)glf 14-15, 78, 120, 129, 233, 265, 282, 285-8, 320
+(X)glXg (< -(X)g+Xg) 152-4, 286
+(X)glXk 153
+(X)gmA 14-15, 127-9, 233, 282-3, 291
+(X)gsA- (< -(X)g+sA-), -(X)sA- 123, 153-4, 228, 302
+(X)k- 79, 97, 129, 132, 228, 241, 532
+(X)k- 97, 129, 132, 229, 241, 434, 517
+(X)l 129, 228
+(X)l- 14, 85, 90, 97, 129, 248, 433
+(X)m 14, 129, 152-3, 227, 389
+(X)m 129, 156, 166, 318
+(X)mA (- -(X)mkA) 178, 184
+(X)mArU 178, 185
+(X)mč 149, 154
+(X)mčñ 185
+(X)mčxg 153, 154, 155
+(X)mčXn- 228
+(X)mčXz 15, 61, 93, 225
+(X)n 14, 55, 61, 129-30, 175-6, 180, 183 (instrumental suffix)
+(X)n 142
+(X)n 90, 128, 152
+(X)n 169 (dissimilatory variant of +(n)Xŋ)
+(X)n 185-6 (accusative marker after possessive suffixes)
+(X)n+ (intercalary element with pronouns) 196
+(X)n- 61, 94, 142, 229, 434
+(X)nč < -(X)n-(X)š 110, 115
+(X)nč 90, 110, 129, 152, 155
+(X)nč 220, 222
+(X)nčXg (< -(X)nč+Xg) 129, 152
+(X)nčXz 152-3, 177, 311
+(X)nčXnXn 176
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-\(X)n\U 113, 128-9, 148, 152
-\(X)n\ 61, 129, 237, 520
-\(X)n\ 129, 160, 165, 184, 234
-\(X)n\p 80, 184
-\(X)n\Ar\U 80
-\(X)nIn 185
-\(X)nAr-9, 237, 520
-\(X)nUr 237
-\(X)nXz 61
-\(X)n(X)zlAr 9, 237, 520
-\(X)nUr 237
-\(X)nUr-250, 252, 253, 254
-\(X)n id-257
-\(X)n kal-250
-\(X)n kod-409
-\(X)n tur-250, 255
-\(X)n 13-14, 17, 61, 90, 94, 129, 132, 143, 177, 201, 206, 219, 229-30, 246-7, 249, 251-4, 257, 260-61, 278, 308, 327, 458-9, 476, 481, 510-11
-\(X)nAn 13, 15, 128-9, 176-7, 229, 278, 308-10, 314, 327, 458
-\(X)nAnIn 15, 236
-\(X)nAnXn 13, 176, 310, 458
-\(X)nKA-128-9, 228
-\(X)n 124, 128-9, 142, 152, 155
-\(X)š-146
-\(X)š-137, 142, 228, 249, 433
-\(X)š+č149
-\(X)št 129, 158
-\(X)š- -\(I)š-18, 70, 97, 110, 120, 129, 131-2, 229, 232, 241, 299, 311, 315, 433; cf. -\(I)š-
-\(X)š(Xn / -\(A)š(Xn / -\(y)šn 129, 316
-\(X)ź 129, 152, 242
-\(X)ź 129, 160, 162-3, 191, 195, 225
-\(X)ź-129, 229
\(y\) 12-13, 19, 30, 34, 44, 52, 54, 62, 69-74, 81, 95, 107, 110, 121, 123, 131, 210, 243, 533
\(y\) 34, 75, 99
\(y\)Ja, -\(y\)A 69, 121, 131, 172-3, 179, 187, 196 (vocative element)
\(y\)a 354 (exclamation)
\(y\)an, \(y\)An 80, 128, 133, 137, 214, 336
\(y\)ana, \(y\)ānā (ōk), yenā 51, 95-6, 107, 150, 165, 328, 338, 509
\(y\)apa 226
\(y\)ar\(l\)g\(k\)a-10, 18, 44, 112, 241, 247, 262, 409, 529
\(y\)y7 96
\(y\)mā / \(y\)āmā 44, 91, 95, 107, 151, 159, 163, 167, 258, 329, 337, 342, 347, 458, 495, 509, 512, 517; cf. \(m\)A.
\(y\)n7 74
\(y\)nā, \(y\)nā 95
\(y\)ok 227, 229, 324, 412, 416
\(y\)ol-\(I\) 164, 224
\(y\)om\(k\), \(y\)om\(k\)\(g\)a 225-6
\(y\)or\(i\)-77, 248-9, 251-2, 323, 325, 534
-\(y\)Ok (-\(y\)Uk ?) 21, 27, 73, 129, 240, 245, 263, 266-8, 272, 278, 293-4, 299-300, 421, 438
\(y\)r > \(r\)y 281
-\(y\)U 128, 311, 458
-\(y\)Ur (< -\(y\)U ār-ār ?) 128, 131-2, 240-41; cf. -\(A\)r, -\(Ir\), -\(Ur\), -\(r\).
\(y\)Xn < \(y\)n 72
\#y\(CV^o\) > \#y\(CV^o\) 107
\#y\(VCV^o\) > \#y\(CV^o\) 107
\(z\) 106
\(z\) /\(z\) 30, 62, 68, 83-5, 105, 116, 118, 121, 163, 179, 236, 241-2, 445
\(z\) ~ \(r\)y 84
-\(z\) 163, 241-2
-\(z\)U, -\(z\)Un\(I\) 236
-\(z\)Un 83, 121, 128, 231, 236-7, 492, 525; cf. -\(z\)Un.
-\(z\)Un\(I\n\) 176, 236
-\(z\)Un\(I\)\(r\) 231, 237
\(\[z\]\) 70, 83-4, 105, 235
-\(z\)Un 235; cf. -\(z\)Un.